REACHING THE UNREACHED

An Assessment of the Alternative Education Programme for Refugee and Undocumented Children in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah
This publication is timely, coming as it does on the 20th anniversary of Malaysia’s ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. That Convention highlights that all children have rights – no matter who they are, where they come from, or where they live.

In the context of Education for All (EFA) goals, that means that children – all children – have a right to education. An alternative route to education for those who do not have access to the national education system is essential in order to fulfil a child’s right to education under the CRC.

In countries like Thailand, Indonesia, India and Bangladesh, evidence has shown government sponsored Alternative Learning Programmes (ALPs) are assisting countries in the Asia-Pacific region to progress more quickly towards their 2015 EFA and Millennium Development Goals, and that such programmes are providing opportunities for disadvantaged and marginalized groups. Malaysia has yet to formally recognize Alternative Learning Programmes as an option to existing formal education. As a result, refugee and undocumented children are unable to access the national education system and have to rely on alternative learning centres managed by NGOs, foundations, churches and other non-government entities for basic primary education to provide basic literacy.

The Education Center in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah is a first initiative by UNICEF in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, the Federal Special Task Force (Sabah/Labuan), the Sabah State Education Department and the Teachers Foundation, to provide access to basic education for refugee and undocumented children. As such, this report provides vital information to enable all stakeholders on how to further build on the initiative, to fulfil the rights to education for all children in Malaysia.

Our experience shows that quality education is affordable. We have to accelerate our efforts not only to do more of what we are doing but to do better in design and delivery. Building new schools, adding classrooms, providing teachers and scholarships helps, but does not in and of itself ensure access to education for all children. The report concludes more support systems are required.

We, at UNICEF Malaysia, are committed to working with partners to protect and promote the rights of all children – to survive and thrive, to learn and grow, to make their voices heard, and to help them reach their full potential.

As Malaysia prepares to pursue its 11th Development Plan and commits to new global Sustainable Development Goals, issues of developing human capital especially through the most basic of building blocks -- by providing quality education to all children -- are timely and crucial.

Let us move forward with a renewed commitment to ensure that this unfinished business, remain our priority as we build a Malaysia fit for all its children.

Wivina Belmonte
UNICEF Representative to Malaysia
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
Impelled by the goals of Education for ALL (EFA) to provide, expand and improve comprehensive education for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children, Alternative Education Programmes (AEP) have increasingly been envisioned as a key strategy “to fill the gap” for marginalized children who are not enrolled in the formal education system due to “age, gender, ethnicity or geographical location” (IIEP, 2009:2). This report represents an assessment of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Malaysia initiative entitled “Reaching the Unreached: An Alternative Education Programme (AEP) for Refugee, Undocumented and Stateless Children in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah”, which ran from 2011 to 2013. UNICEF Malaysia provided RM 422,715.16 for the viable alternative education project in partnership with the Ministry of Education (MoE), Malaysia, Federal Special Task Force (FSTF), Malaysian Teacher’s Foundation (MTF), and the local community with a focus on sustainable alternative education policy development in Malaysia and partnerships to scale up successful interventions for the long-standing issue of marginalized immigrants in Sabah in particular, and Malaysia in general. In October 2012, UNICEF Malaysia contracted Universiti Malaysia Sabah to conduct the assessment.

Scope and Methods
The focal point of the study was the Numbak Education Centre (NEC) project, with the assessment period being from the project’s inception in January 2011 until March 2013. A number of key parameters were established: (1) Relevance (Why was the project needed?); (2) Effectiveness (What were the results of the project?); (3) Efficiency (How well was the project administered?); (4) Outcome (What are the positive and negative consequences arising from the project’s activities?); and (5) Sustainability (Does the project have a future?). The assessment took the form of a theory-based assessment of the antecedents, processes and results of AEP strategies and activities; it employed a participatory approach drawing on a mixture of information sources – quantitative and qualitative, primary and secondary. The assessment relied on data from four sources: (1) a review of existing policy and programme documents (to understand the policy environment governing education for refugee and undocumented children); (2) a review of Kampung Numbak project documents; (3) a review of the Education Centre’s records on (a) school environment; (b) school achievement of learners, and (c) budget and expenditure; (4) primary data collection from stakeholders (MoE, MTF, and FSTF officers, parents, teachers, children) designed to facilitate an in-depth understanding of the provision and results of education from the perspective of different stakeholders through (a) focus group discussions with parents, villagers, and children; (b) interviews with Government officials, community leaders, and NGO representatives; (c) case studies of selected children’s life success stories; (d) product analysis of objects created by the children; and (e) roundtable discussion with existing stakeholders, non-governmental organisations and potential future stakeholders.

Conclusions
The conclusions presented here are based on the findings detailed in the body of the report. They are based on the five parameters used in the assessment: (1) Relevance, (2) Effectiveness, (3) Efficiency, (4) Outcomes, and (5) Sustainability.

Relevance
NEC was established in response to two factors: Firstly, the undocumented and stateless children faced difficulties in gaining access to mainstream schools; and secondly, the Kampung Numbak parents recognised the need for their children to receive a formal education.
**Effectiveness**
The first major achievement of the AEP was the building of the Numbak Educare Centre (NEC). Since its completion, the operation of the centre has been monitored and supervised from time to time by the main stakeholders, and enrolment in the centre has increased every year. However, despite these early successes, there have also been challenges. Firstly, the allocation of teaching resources for the centre has been insufficient. Secondly, the mentor-mentee programme has not been properly developed. Thirdly, spending on children and teacher development has been inadequate. Finally, the AEP's two year model at NEC does not meet the five year standard in accordance with the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

**Efficiency**
The key stakeholders (UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, SSED and MTF) have successfully fulfilled their roles in planning, building, supervising and monitoring the centre. However, SESD and MTF could be more prominent in assisting the centre. SESD could have further assisted MOE in micro level supervision and monitoring. MTF could further procure funding and teaching materials. The school has successfully changed the behaviour, attitude and values of the students, parents and villagers. In addition, the community has also played its role by providing informal education and motivating teachers and students. Moreover, the community has provided school uniforms, paid fees, organised fund raising events, monitored progress and provided support for FSTF, MOE and UNICEF activities.

**Outcomes**
The programme has brought positive effects to the students, teachers and community. Student outcomes include improved literary and numeracy, knowledge and practices of religion, civic and citizenship consciousness, self-management and living skills. These outcomes have positive implications for daily life and future employment. The teachers have gained in terms of financial income as well as improved content knowledge and instructional skills. Community benefits include increased awareness of education for the future, enhanced religious values and practices, and positive changes in attitude, behaviour and lifestyle. No negative effects were evident during the programme assessment period.

**Sustainability**
Programme strengths identified include community willingness to contribute a workforce and financial support; the desire for the continuation of the school by parents and children; the recognition of the NEC completion certificate by employers; and the sense of community belonging acknowledged by students. However, the programme has also faced challenges, such as ensuring NEC continuation, insufficient teacher training, lack of facilities and systematic documentation. Amendments need to be made to ensure sustainability. These amendments include upgrading the facilities, improving the quality and quantity of learning resources, conducting systematic monitoring system, developing the workforce, and increasing financial resources. If the scope of the programme is to be enlarged, five factors need to be taken into consideration namely, policy-in-place, accreditation, programme specifications, capacity building and sustainable financial resources.

**Recommendations**
Based on the findings above, it is recommended that:

i) **UNICEF.**
   - Seek partnerships from NGOs for knowledge,
expertise and experience sharing.

- Seek partnerships with government and private agencies to sustain the alternative learning programme.

ii) MOE
- Continue to monitor the teaching and learning process and assessment conducted in NEC.
- Set up a working committee consisting of representatives from the MOE, Ministry of Finance and possibly FSTF to oversee the budget for the running of NEC.
- Facilitate the formulation of a common framework for the management of AEP

iii) FSTF
- Assist in establishing business opportunities which can contribute to NEC financially and provide employment opportunities to the graduates
- Continue to supervise and monitor the programme and bridge the roles of the main stakeholders.
- Set up a Board of Governors consisting of representatives from UNICEF, FSTF, MOE, UMS, the local government, the Heads of the Village and Food for Hungry International.
- Encourage and assist the community to take ownership of NEC.

iv) NEC
- Continue to improve the delivery of the curriculum, assessment and management of the AEP.
- Systematise documentation and record keeping related to the management of the centre, human resources and student affairs and achievement.
- Formalise and systematise the mentoring of the current teachers.

v) Community members in Kampung Numbak
- Assist in day-to-day operation of libraries and canteen, and in the maintenance of cleanliness and security of NEC (through voluntary groups such as ‘caring mums’ and ‘emergency response squad’)
- Take an active role in income generating activities to support NEC.
- Seek contribution from religious bodies (e.g. Pusat Zakat) and elected representatives.
- Contribute financially to NEC.

vi) UMS
- Provide consultancy on teacher training support and mentoring of teachers
- Assist in establishing income generating activities.

vii) Teacher Education Institutions in Sabah
- Provide teacher training support and mentoring of existing teachers.
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1.1 Introduction

The chapter introduces the background of Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia and the implemented alternative education programme (AEP) in Numbak Educare (NEC), followed by the objectives of this assessment. The second section includes a detailed description of the methodology. The next section describes the context where the programme was implemented. The final section outlines an overview of the report.

1.2 Project context

Kampung Numbak is one of the many village settlements built on stilts, found all over the coast of Sabah, housing the much maligned group of migrants from neighbouring countries of the Philippines and Indonesia. In this study, they are referred to as refugee and undocumented people. Kampung Numbak settlement is a village located about 25 km from the state capital of Kota Kinabalu, situated along the coastline of Sepanggar Bay, facing the South China Sea. The development of Kampung Numbak can be divided into three phases based on chronology of establishment. The original Kampung Numbak was established many years ago and was populated by local Malaysians, whereas Kampung Numbak Baru 1 and Kampung Numbak Baru 2 were subsequently built in stages until 2007 to house refugee and undocumented people. Kampung Numbak Educare Centre (NEC), the pilot Alternative Education Programme (AEP) project for refugee and undocumented children, is situated in between Kampung Numbak Baru 1 and Kampung Numbak Baru 2. These three clusters are collectively known as Kampung Numbak today.

There are approximately 5,000 villagers in Kampung Numbak and a total of 3,000 people hold Malaysian citizenship. A majority of the villagers, approximately 70%, work in neighbouring towns. The remaining 30% of the villagers depend on fishery as their main source of income. A total of 60% of the villagers are Bajau Ubians and about 30% are Suluks. The remaining villagers are Kagayaan.

Although Kampung Numbak is situated relatively close to Kota Kinabalu city, it is still somewhat inaccessible. Before the road to Kampung Numbak was connected to the Menggatal town area, the villagers used to travel, trade and obtain their supplies for their daily needs by taking boats on the Menggatal River or Camp River to Kota Kinabalu city or Menggatal town. Even so, there are people who still use the direct sea route to Kota Kinabalu, especially fishermen who choose to send their catch directly to town. Despite the existing road being less than satisfactory and requiring regular maintenance, the road network is still the preferred option of travel chosen by most people of Kampung Numbak. However, during the rainy season, the road condition deteriorates and becomes slippery and muddy.

As parents seek part time jobs, children often spend their days loitering in the vicinity of the village. Access to education is not something they take for granted since many are without birth registration, despite being born in Malaysia.

The Ministry of Education (MOE) conducted a study in 2009 and found 43,973 undocumented children in Malaysia between the ages of 7 to 17 years old not in schools. The findings led to the MOE working in partnership with UNICEF and FSTF towards providing access to basic education for refugee and undocumented children in Kampung Numbak. The Kampung Numbak Educare Centre (NEC) was completed in 2010 and was officially opened on 26th March, 2011. Since its establishment, NEC has accepted more than 300 children.

1.3 Background of the project

The purpose for the NEC project was to pilot a model for alternative education with an intention to expand in the future. The goal of the AEP at
Kampung Numbak is to ensure all the refugee and undocumented children can acquire basic knowledge such as civics, religious studies, reading, counting and writing. The long term target is to provide the children with sufficient knowledge and skills to enable them to gain employment or to be self-sufficient. The main objective of the AEP in Kampung Numbak is to provide alternative education pathways for the children who lacked the proper documentation to gain access to mainstream education in Malaysian government schools.

NEC was established through a partnership comprising various governmental and non-governmental agencies. The partnership involved UNICEF, the MOE Malaysia, the Sabah State Education Department (SSED), the Federal Special Task Force (FSTF), the Malaysia Teachers’ Foundation (MTF) and the Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre (NEC). The relationship of the organizations involved in the partnership is shown in Figure 1.1.

FIGURE 1.1 SMART PARTNERSHIP PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

As can be seen, all five organisations have key roles to play in the project. According to the UNICEF concept paper (2011-2012), each respective organization has the following role:

i. **UNICEF:** To advocate, facilitate and provide funding for the program, and assist in the monitoring of the centre.

ii. **Ministry of Education (MOE):** To provide advice and facilitate the programme planning and implementation, supervise and monitor activities, provide training to the teachers (including teachers from other centres under FSTF), assist in providing health education as well as skill-based training and vocational skills, and assist in the financial administration of the programme.

iii. **Federal Special Task Force (FSTF):** To manage the financial accounts of the program, appoint teachers for the education centre, ensure the security and safety of the students, teachers and the local community, assist in the operation of the centre, assist in the delivery of textbooks and teaching aids and ensure the periodic maintenance of the centre.

iv. **Sabah State Education Department (SSED):** The roles of SSED in the project were to assist...
MOE in the supervision and monitoring activities at micro level as well as contribute textbooks to NEC.

v. **Malaysia Teachers’ Foundation (MTF):** The roles of MTF in the project were to assist MOE, FSTF and UNICEF in the implementation of the project, assist MOE in teacher training programmes along with assisting in procuring extra funding and teaching materials for the project. NEC management consists of six teachers, one of whom is the head teacher. Each teacher is assigned to one classroom. The NEC management structure can be simplified as seen in Figure 1.2.

**FIGURE 1.2 NEC MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE**

![NEC Management Structure Diagram]

UNICEF Malaysia works in partnership with the government, private sectors, NGOs, and individuals for policy advocacy to deliver better services for children in Malaysia. According to UNICEF, the Malaysian government is their main partner, with non-governmental organisations, both international and national, youth groups, women’s organisations, religious groups, communities and families also contributing to alternative education programmes. UNICEF works with MOE to develop better policy, curriculum and assessment, aiming at constructing quality alternative education for children not accessing mainstream government schools.

UNICEF provided a series of questions based on five main criteria for the assessment of the AEP in Kampung Numbak. The details will be further discussed in Section 1.4. At this stage, the AEP at Kampung Numbak is in its third and final year of implementation. This pilot programme is scheduled to end in 2013.

### 1.4 Purpose and objectives

Two years after the implementation of the programme, in November 2012, UNICEF contracted Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) to conduct an assessment of the programme. The purpose of the assessment was to provide evidence of the impact, strengths, weaknesses and challenges of AEP in Kampung Numbak. The findings of this assessment will serve as reference for expansion and replication of the programme in similar contexts. The generated evidence is expected to be used as a reference point in the process of the development of a National Alternative Education Policy by MOE and other policy-makers in the country.
The specific objectives of the assessment, are as follows:

1. To determine the relevance of the programme vis-à-vis the situation of children in the communities of intervention, and UNICEF’s commitments regarding their educational needs

2. To determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme

3. To identify the outcomes generated for the children, teachers and community at the programme site

4. To identify the sustainability strategies beyond the phase of UNICEF’s support;

5. To determine whether this model is replicable on a large scale in order to respond to the needs of all undocumented children; and

6. To suggest recommendations for improvements and a way forward.

1.5 Scope of assessment

The assessment covered the implementation of Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre project since its inception in January 2011 until October 2012. The following series of questions were investigated in order to meet the assessment objectives:

**Relevance of the project (why was the project needed)**

- What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?
- Did it require action to address the situation of these children? If Yes, by who and how?
- How did the need for intervention fit into the plans of local authorities and existing schools?
- How did the need for intervention fit into UNICEF’s mandate in general and with UNICEF’s concerns in Malaysia in particular?
Effectiveness (what are the results of the project)

- What were the project’s objectives and were they met? Were they met on time as planned? How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?

- What were the components of the project, e.g. a. build education centre, b. ensure teachers’ qualification, c. procure teaching materials. What were the specificities of these components?

- How many teachers were trained? Was their capacity building appropriate and sufficient to prepare them for the tasks they were given? What were the main areas, in which they were trained?

- How many children were enrolled in education activities? Did the number change over the two-year period?

- What were the subjects taught? What other activities were conducted with the learners?

Efficiency (how did the project operate)

- What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MOE? What was the role of the school and the community?

- What was the budget of the project? Who contributed to it? What proportions were spent for salaries, school materials, extra-curricular activities, investment/building maintenance?

- What is the approximate cost for teaching one child for one school year? What is the approximate cost of training one teacher?
**Outcome (what are the positive and negative changes caused by the project’s activities)**

- What are the main results of the project? How many children in total benefited from it to date?
- What are the school achievements of these children? Did test/achievement scores change, when compared to project initiation, at the end of year one, at the end of year two?
- Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?
- What advantages did project participants get, compared to the population not included in the project (both learners and teachers) in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc. Is there evidence of such advantages?
- Are there any negative effects caused by the project?

**Sustainability (is the project likely to have a future)**

- Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?
- Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation?
- Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MOE, from other parties?
- Is the model worth a large scale investment to cover all marginalised (undocumented, migrant) children? What amendments that might be necessary in order for the project to be applied in different contexts within the country?

### 1.6 Methodology

#### 1.6.1 Research approach

The principal approach adopted in the study was the participatory approach. The approach entailed adapting the social context of evaluation based on three important dimensions; understanding the social ecology of the site, identifying appropriate research methods relevant to the context whilst empowering relevant stakeholders to bring about social change (Rossi and Freeman, 1993). These procedures involve programme stakeholders such as teachers, in data collection activities. Findings of this programme are then shared with all stakeholders to allow them to plan further action for programme improvement and sustainability.

To operationalize the approach, the assessment was divided into two stages comprising qualitative and quantitative data. The first stage included review and analysis of existing government policy on alternative education and programme documents as well as a social visit to the Kampung Numbak community. During this stage, stated objectives, intended outcomes, and criteria for this programme as well as the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation group were referred to develop relevant instruments. The second stage involved data collection and during this stage, the research team entered the community daily to record and document data; and facilitate reflection and feedback on the agreed criteria.

Stakeholder participation in the study was generated in the following ways: Firstly, two NEC students participated in a photovoice activity. Photovoice method otherwise known as Participatory Photography approach is often used in the field of community development, public health, and education. This method combines photography with social actions at community level and was founded by Caroline Wang and Mary Ann Burris in 1992. Participants of photovoice are normally asked to represent their community or point of view by...
taking photographs, discussing them together and developing narratives to go with their photos. It is often used among marginalized people, and is aimed at providing insight into how they conceptualize their circumstances and their hopes for the future (Wang, 1999). The students captured photos reflecting the theme ‘Learning’ in NEC and around the village. A follow-up interview was conducted for the students to relate their feelings and opinions concerning the photos captured (Wang, 1999). Secondly, two students participated in image analysis. The students were asked to draw two objects reflecting their life in the village. A follow-up interview was conducted for the students to express their feelings and ideas about their drawings.

1.6.2 Research methods
Both quantitative and qualitative methods of enquiries were employed in this assessment, and they included:

i. Document analysis: The systematic examination of programme documents.

ii. Product analysis: A systematic examination of any student or stakeholder created objects to assess the effectiveness of program activities.

iii. In-depth interview: A directed conversation with an individual using a list of questions designed to gather extended responses.

iv. Focus group interview: A group of individuals who provide information during a directed and moderated interactive group discussion.
v. Observations: The systematic observation of programme processes or operations using a checklist and narrative comments.

vi. Survey questionnaire: A series of questions administered to individuals in a systematic manner.


viii. Roundtable discussion: A stakeholders’ discussion on issues and recommendations based on findings of the assessment.

The instruments required response from all stakeholders of the programme. The selection of students for the interviews was based on their academic performance; low, intermediate and advanced. Parents and villagers participated in the interviews on a voluntary basis. The numbers of parents, villagers, teachers and students involved in data collection are as follows:

i. Parents: 9
ii. Villagers: 10
iii. Teachers: 6
iv. Current students: 171
v. Ex-students: 6

1.6.3 Sample and respondents
The respondents involved in the assessment project are shown in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.1 RESPONDENTS INVOLVED IN EACH METHOD OF ENQUIRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In-depth interview | • Head of village  
   • Head Teacher  
   • FSTF Director  
   • FSTF former Director  
   • Chairman of MTF  
   • Representative from MOE  
   • Representative from UNICEF | 1  
   1  
   1  
   1  
   1  
   1  
   1 |
| Focus-group interview | • IPG Kent trainers  
   • Parents  
   • Students  
   • Teachers  
   • Villagers | 1  
   9  
   11  
   6  
   10 |
| Observation | • Teachers  
   • Students | 6  
   171 |
| Survey questionnaire | • Students | 171 |
| Case study | • Graduated students  
   • Students | 6  
   4 |
1.6.4 Research procedures
The data collection process began with analysing relevant documents obtained from MOE, UNICEF, FSTF, MTF, NEC and the Internet. The documents included concept papers, progress reports, international agency policies, Malaysian government policies, school records and other published reports and articles on AEP. The information was analysed to review existing AEPs practised in other countries. A comparison on the characteristics of existing AEPs and the planned AEP in Kampung Numbak was made. A synthesis of the review and comparison was produced and submitted to UNICEF.

In the next stage, five instruments and protocols (Refer Annex A, B, C, D and E) were developed. The instruments developed were cross-checked and approved by UNICEF to ensure the relevance of the instruments in achieving the objectives.

1.6.5 Instrumentation and data collection
Methods of enquiry included policy and product analysis; interviews; questionnaires; observation and case studies. The procedures involved in developing the instruments are shown in Table 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS OF ENQUIRY</th>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy analysis    | - Review of documents for policy analysis.  
                    - Review of documents for the process and product of the programme.  
                    - Consolidate information and write up policy analysis. | Documents obtained from the Internet, UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, MTF, IPG Kent, and NEC. |
| Product analysis   | - Collect relevant information.  
                    - Randomly sample students’ and teachers’ product.  
                    - Systematically examine the products according to objectives and scope of the assessment. | Annex A |
| In-depth interviews and focus group interviews | - Design of interview protocol.  
                    - Getting feedback for interview protocol.  
                    - Setting interview appointments.  
                    - Conduct interviews  
                    - Transcribe and analysis | Annex B |
| Survey questionnaire | - Design of questionnaire.  
                    - Getting feedback on questionnaire.  
                    - Administration of Questionnaire  
                    - Analysis | Annex C |
| Observation        | - Design observation protocol and observation schedule.  
                    - Getting feedback for observation protocol. | Annex D |
| Case study         | - Design case study format.  
                    - Getting feedback for case study format.  
                    - Recording students’ narratives through visual and oral methods after receiving permission from legal guardians.  
                    - Compiling students’ narratives according to the format. | Annex E |
| Roundtable discussion | - Presentation of findings to stakeholders  
                    - Receiving feedback and comments  
                    - Discussion of arising issues  
                    - Adjusting and fine-tuning recommendations |
In the third stage, survey questionnaires (Refer Annex C) were administered to the students in NEC. NEC teachers helped in identifying parents, villagers and students for interviews. In-depth and focus group interviews with parents, villagers and students were conducted. In the following stage, teaching and learning process in NEC was documented through observation. Email and telephone interviews were conducted to verify and further clarify information. Throughout the visits to NEC, documentation such as photos and videos were collected for triangulation. The procedure of the data collection is summarised in Figure 1.3.

Data obtained was analysed. The five areas of the study namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and sustainability were studied and addressed from a human rights perspective. Finally, the main findings were triangulated to assure conformability of the themes.

**FIGURE 1.3 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE**
1.7 Significance of the study

This assessment project of the AEP at Kampung Numbak was commissioned by UNICEF. The project fits into UNICEF’s work in Malaysia. UNICEF’s mandate states that:

UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.

UNICEF website, 2007

In line with UNICEF’s mandate, UNICEF in Malaysia works to ensure that these following objectives are met:

i. where all children have their rights upheld and respected, regardless of race, gender, nationality, religion or material wealth;

ii. where investment in children is a key strategy to achieve national development goals, reflected in decisions in all spheres and at all levels of society, and

iii. Malaysia as the very best place for a child to be born, grow and realise his or her full potential.

(UNICEF Malaysia, 2012b)

The intervention, AEP in Kampung Numbak, is aligned to both the UNICEF mandate and UNICEF Malaysia’s objectives. Through the AEP in Kampung Numbak, UNICEF Malaysia sought to fulfil the mandate advocated by UNICEF by protecting children’s rights, providing basic educational needs and enable children’s potential through basic literacy and life skills training. Secondly, as of March 2013, UNICEF Malaysia has made funding available to establish, develop, implement, and monitor the AEP in Kampung Numbak. UNICEF Malaysia has involved both governmental and non-governmental agencies from various levels of society to ensure that the AEP reflects Malaysian societal beliefs and norms. Thirdly, by aligning the AEP curriculum with the curriculum used in mainstream schools in Malaysia, children from the AEP would contribute to societal functions and dynamics in ways similar to those of children from mainstream schools.

Education for refugee and undocumented children are available in patches provided by the community, foundations, NGOs, and religious groups. However, there has never been a policy or guideline for the provision of education for non-Malaysian citizens. Hence, UNICEF Malaysia in collaboration with MOE, is committed to support the Education Centre in Kampung Numbak as a pilot project for alternative education. During this period, UNICEF will continue to advocate for the provision of education and other social services to be extended to refugees and other marginalized communities currently deprived of their basic rights.

Dr. Nur Anuar Abdul Muthalib, Education Specialist, UNICEF, 26/3/2013

1.8 Limitations

The assessment process faced six constraints:

i. Timeframe.

The duration of the assessment contracted by UNICEF was only for six months.

ii. Access to the Kampung Numbak and NEC.

NEC in Kampung Numbak is categorised as a security zone. Therefore, the research team had to obtain approval from the FSTF prior to every visit to the village.
iii. Effects of the intrusion in Lahad Datu

Due to the intrusion in Lahad Datu by followers of ‘The Sultan of Sulu’ in February 2013 (Reuters, 2013, March 3), access to NEC for follow up data collection was disrupted due to safety and security concerns. Consequently, meetings with the members of the Kampung Numbak community were conducted in a nearby commercial complex. The incident also jeopardised the possibility of sustaining the programme due the less positive image associated with Filipino descendants in Sabah, particularly the Suluks. The incident also caused FSTF’s focus, manpower and resources to be shifted to Lahad Datu. As a result, accessibility to the FSTF became more difficult.

iv. Absence of a comparison group

The non-existence of a comparison group did not allow the research team to compare quantitative findings.

v. Communication with children and villagers

Some student and villager respondents could not converse fluently in standard Bahasa Malaysia which resulted in some communication difficulties with researchers. Bahasa Malaysia is not widely used in the village.

1.9 Ethical considerations

The research team obtained clearance from UMS Committee for Ethics in Research Involving Human Subjects prior to data collection. The research team considered the following aspects in ensuring that the rights of the stakeholders and the children are protected.

i. Voluntary participation

All the participants participated voluntarily. The UMS team met parents and villagers and sought their consent prior to conducting interviews.
ii. Privacy and confidentiality

In protecting the identities of the participants, all the names used in the report are pseudonyms, with the exception of the representative of UNICEF, the representative of MOE, the Director of FSTF and the ex-Director of FSTF.

iii. Informed consent

An informed consent form was prepared and distributed to all participants prior to the data collection. The forms were duly signed by the participants.

iv. Feedback to stakeholders and participants

A roundtable discussion was conducted upon obtaining approval from UNICEF. The discussion involved existing and potential stakeholders of the programme. It sought their further insights and participation in finalising the recommendations, identifying the action points for each stakeholder and commitment for the sustenance of NEC and other AEPs in Sabah.

1.10 Organisation of the report

This chapter describes the objectives of assessment, followed by the methodological approach used to achieve the objectives. The next chapter describes AEP in the UNICEF and Malaysian contexts. It also highlights some of the main characteristics of AEP practised in other countries. The next chapter also presents the conceptual framework applied in this assessment.

The following five chapters present the areas studied in this assessment:

i. Relevance
ii. Effectiveness
iii. Efficiency
iv. Outcomes
v. Sustainability

In each chapter, data from multiple sources, including interviews from stakeholders, survey questionnaire from students, photos and observations of teaching and learning are presented. The chapters also include a discussion of the findings and its implications.

Chapter VIII provides a summary of the main findings. The final chapter presents recommendations and the way forward for AEP in Malaysia.

1.11 Definition of terms

i. Relevance

Relevance refers to the factors that are directly related to the project. “Something is relevant to a task (T) if it increases the likelihood of accomplishing the goal, which is implied by T.” (Hjørland & Christensen, 2002, in Hjørland, 2010) In this AEP programme assessment, the relevance is investigated in terms of the antecedent and the process. For example, all physical factors such as the NEC and infrastructure are the antecedents while implementing the AEP curriculum is the process.

ii. Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the capability of bringing about an outcome or outcomes. When something is deemed effective, it means that it has an intended or expected outcome. In this project, effectiveness is judged by measurable outcomes of the implemented programme. For example, the increased number of students who could read, write and count is an indicator of effectiveness of the programme.

iii. Efficiency

Efficiency illustrates the modus-operandi of the project. In general, efficiency is a measurable concept, quantitatively determined by the ratio of output to input. It is to consider the correctness of the modus-operandi. In this
programme assessment, efficiency considers how NEC operates the AEP. For example, how the teachers deliver lessons to the students.

iv. Outcomes

An outcome is something that programme participants can perform upon the completion of the programme. It also points to result or consequence of doing something. Outcomes can be positive or negative. In this programme assessment, outcomes refer to the positive and negative changes that occurred at the end of the AEP. For example, more students demonstrated positive behavioural changes when attending mosque sessions is an indicator of positive outcome of the AEP.

v. Sustainability

Sustainability is the capacity to ensure continuation. In other words, the sustainability of this AEP programme must be supported with evidence of long term economic benefits, social and communal engagement and commitments to create better living environment.

vi. Scale-up

The process of scaling-up involves reaching larger numbers of a target community in a broader geographic area by institutionalizing an effective programme (African Youth Alliance, 2004).

vii. Alternative Education

Alternative education encompasses any education programmes which are not considered formal education programmes and offered in parallel with the national formal education system (IIEP, 2009).

viii. Alternative Education Programme

Alternative education programmes (AEP) are targeted for marginalised children in their own community. These programmes are designed in collaboration with their immediate community and are referred to as “community education” or “community schools” (Farrell & Hartwell, 2008: 10).

ix. Evaluation

Evaluation is the process of ascertaining the worth or arriving at decisions about a programme based on scientific approach. For example, programme evaluation can assist an organization to assess any aim or realisable concept/proposal that is useful to help decision-making. It is also to ascertain the degree of achievement or value in regard to the aim and objectives and results of any such action that has been completed.

1.12 Summary

The assessment project was conducted to evaluate the piloted AEP at Kampung Numbak. The project employed participatory approach from the human rights perspectives to evaluate the five criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome and sustainability of the programme. Methods of inquiry included document analysis, product analysis, in-depth interviews, focus group interviews, observations, survey questionnaires and case studies. All the stakeholders, UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, MTF, NEC and the Kampung Numbak community, participated in this project.
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2.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with defining alternative education programme (AEP) based on existing literature. The next sections highlights policies related to children’s rights and education as stated in United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), UNESCO’s Education for All (EFA) and United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). The following section focus on the UNICEF and UNICEF Malaysia’s mandates pertaining to children’s education. The next section presents a review of existing AEPs in Asian countries, followed by AEPs practised in Malaysia. Finally, the chapter discusses the framework used in the present research.

2.2 An overview of alternative education programmes

Alternative education encompasses any education programmes which are not considered formal education programmes and are offered in parallel with the national formal education system (IIEP, 2009). There are two types of alternative education system; “alternative means of access to education” and “alternative in curriculum provision” (IIEP, 2009: 2). “Alternative means of access to education” provide a different delivery method to “fill the gap” of a child’s education need for those who are not enrolled in the formal education system due to “age, gender, ethnicity or geographical location” (IIEP, 2009: 2). “Alternative in curriculum provision” provides non-traditional or contextualized subjects either within or in parallel with formal education system for a short duration with learners of different age (IIEP, 2009: 2). For example, in a post-conflict country, landmine awareness is introduced to all citizens – ranging from children to adults.

AEPs are targeted toward marginalised children in their own community. These programmes are designed in collaboration with their immediate community and referred to as “community education” or “community schools” (Farrell & Hartwell, 2008: 10). One of the aims of an AEP is to realise one of the goals of Education for All (EFA), namely ensuring the development of children’s knowledge, skills and behaviour, and thus contributing to the children’s social well-being (Farrell & Hartwell, 2008: 8). The concept of AEP differs significantly from formal education programmes as stated below (Farrell & Hartwell, 2008: 19):

- Pedagogy leans toward children-centred instead of teacher-centred.
- School focus leans more toward learning and much less on teaching.
- Active learning is advocated.
- Children are graded according to level of competency with continuous progress learning.
- School year is adapted to local context, as needed.
- Strong involvement of different stakeholders i.e. community, partially-trained teachers and full-trained teachers in the children’s learning and school administration.
- Peer tutoring whereby a more proficient child helps and teaches a younger less proficient child.
- Self-guided learning materials are developed to promote responsibility towards self-learning whereby the children – either individually or in a group – are able to attempt these materials at their own pace with help from teachers or other children.
- Materials are developed collaboratively between the teacher and the children.
- The children are actively involved in the governance and administration of the school.
• The use of media, such as radio, television and computers, to deliver learning is context-dependent.

• Constant and intensive in-service training and peer-mentoring for the teachers.

• A cyclical monitoring/evaluation/feedback system providing opportunity for the system to organically modify its methodology depending on its experience.

• Free access of children and adults between school and community.

• Attention from community on nutrition and health needs of the young children before school age.

Most AEPs are designed to provide marginalised children an entry point to continue into the formal education system. This programme is sometimes termed as Accelerated Learning Programmes (ALP) to help marginalised children complete basic education, attain educational qualifications in a shorter duration and be reintegrated into the formal education system (IIEP, 2006). ALP seeks to achieve the following aims (UNESCO, 2012):

• providing an abridged but intensive learning to develop a strong foundation of literacy and numeracy skills,

• implementing an education system equivalent with formal education levels,

• propagating flexible methodologies,

• shaping children to be global citizens by inculcating lifelong learning skills such as life skills and civic responsibility,

• providing education opportunities for disadvantaged, difficult to reach, or marginalised children.
2.3 Alternative education programme in an Asian context

AEPs have a strong presence and long history in Asian countries, particularly in India, the Philippines and Indonesia, and at developing stages in Nepal, Bangladesh and Myanmar. The majority of AEPs implemented observe the accelerated learning concept, and aims to reach the unreached i.e. children living in poverty, girls, ethnic minorities, children with disabilities, refugees, children living in post-conflict settings and immigrant/internally displaced children.

### TABLE 2.1 AEPs IN ASIAN REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and AEP</th>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong></td>
<td>BRAC Education Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core Subjects: Bengali, Math, English, Environmental study, Religious Studies, PE, Arts and Craft, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social values, human rights, financial education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme conducted in BRAC Learning Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td>Open Basic Education Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic and Vocational subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme conducted in Continuing Education Centers (CECs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td>Paket A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moral-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Life skills oriented subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme conducted in CLCs, or via E-learning, mobile classrooms, home-schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myanmar</strong></td>
<td>Non Formal Primary Education (NFPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core subjects: Burmese, English, Mathematics, and General Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme conducted in Flexible NFPE centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepal</strong></td>
<td>Flexible Schooling Programme (FSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School Out Reach Programme (SOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non Formal Adult Schooling Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Urban Out of Schooling Programme (UOSP) supported by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Girls Access to Education (GATE) supported by World Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mother tongue based equivalency program for school dropout supported by UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Assisted Schooling Programme (CASP) (Bhattarai, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core subjects: literacy, numeracy, Nepali and English Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concentration on subjects most relevant to the programmes for example GATE selects reproductive health, UOSP on life skills and protection issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme conducted in community centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Philippines</strong></td>
<td>Accelerated Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Basic Literacy Programme (BLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accreditation and Equivalency (A&amp;E) Informal Education (Corpuz, n.d.&amp;Panalingan, n.d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core subjects: English Language, Filipino, Science, Mathematics and Makabayan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focuses on communication skills, problem-solving and critical thinking, sustainable use of resources/productivity, development of self and a sense of community, and expanding one’s world vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Target can be children and adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methodology reflects experiential learning – Activity, Analysis, Abstraction and Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rigorous monitoring and feedback system is put in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a number of commonalities and idiosyncrasies amongst different AEP studied by the research team, even though their aims and objectives are mainly providing basic education to the marginalised. It can be seen that each AEP is designed and executed according to contextual landscape of the individual country. The challenges faced also appear to be similar, in particular, issues related to appropriate provision and management of resources and accreditation.

Some common features of AEPs in these countries include:

i. Condensed but intensive learning to build strong foundation skills of literacy and Numeracy;

ii. Reaching difficult to reach/disadvantaged communities;

iii. Equivalence with levels in the formal system;

iv. Flexible methodologies;

v. Link to lifelong learning, life skills, civic responsibility...global citizenship

### 2.4 Alternative education programme in a Malaysian context

Formal education refers to services provided and made available in a formal institution of learning provided to the citizens of a particular country. In the Malaysian context, formal education begins at the age of four (kindergarten level) and continues to nineteen (upper secondary level) (MOE, 2012a). The formal education system in Malaysia reflects a linear


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>IMPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>A child is given the rights to enrol in primary school, whether the school is government–based or privately run for the duration of compulsory education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Each child can access a world class quality education that encourages full potential of individuals for national development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Primary schooling is compulsory for all Malaysians and should last for five to seven years irrespective whether the schools are national schools, national-type schools or private schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of education</td>
<td>Children should receive formal education that is stipulated in the national education system in order to develop the potential of individuals in a holistic and integrated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>The wellbeing of the family, the society and nation lies in the access and quality of education received by individuals. Such efforts are made to produce a desired behaviour change in individuals in order to contribute to the betterment of the family, society and the nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
top-down design beginning with education policies which are translated into action in the form of the national curriculum. The MOE ensures a centralized curriculum is implemented nationwide whereby learners are educated and shaped according to the nation’s vision (MOE, 2012b). Embedded within the national curriculum are components such as the national philosophy of education, aims and objectives, syllabus, methodology, assessment and teacher training. Teachers working in national schools are trained for duration of three to five years and are expected to be well-equipped with pedagogical and methodological knowledge. Training takes place at teacher education institutions and involves education degree programmes at higher education institutions.

The governance of education in Malaysia is stipulated in the Education Act 1996 (Act 550) (The Education Act 1996, 2006). Table 2.1 highlights the implications of the Act on rights, accessibility, opportunity, type, and outcomes of education for all children.

One of the missions of the Education Act of 1996 (Act 550) (The Education Act 1996, 2006) is to develop a world class quality education. It is established to help nurture and realised the full potential of all Malaysian children so that they can contribute to national development. The National Education Policy expresses that the wellbeing of the family, society and the nation according to access and quality of education received by individuals. The Act covers education for all children and yet contains no reference to refugee and undocumented children.

An example of AEP in Malaysia is the Humana Child Aid Society’s project in providing education to children in plantations in Sabah (UNICEF, 2012b). A total of 21 major and SME plantation companies contributed in establishing the centres. The project commenced in 1991. It has so far provided more than 10,000 children with an education. The learning centres provide education to children of workers in plantations, children in towns and children of ethnic minorities without access to education. The
curriculum provided focuses on reading, writing and mathematics. Currently, there are 200 teachers employed by Humana and 109 teachers sent by the Indonesian government.

An assessment conducted by UNICEF and UPSI found a number of shortcomings, namely:

i. The visions and objectives of the project fall short in meeting the standard of preschool and primary education.

ii. The centres lack facilities for learning.

iii. Teachers do not have the right qualifications and professional training.

iv. The curriculum is not up-to-date

v. Students must be given individual attention in learning.

vi. Enrolment is declining as children grow older

vii. Lack of reward and recognition for the teachers.

Another example of AEP in Malaysia is the education provided to the Myanmar Rohingyas refugees. The project was initiated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The schools are also supported by several non-governmental organisations including the Muslim Welfare Association of Malaysia (PERKIM), the Tzi Chi Foundation, the Future Global Network Foundation, Yayasan Salam, the Malaysian Islamic Youth Movement (ABIM) and the Harvest Centre Sdn Bhd and World Vision. Curriculum taught differs from one school to another. Some of the subjects taught include Bahasa Malaysia, Myanmar Language, English, Mathematics, Science, Moral Education, Arts and Islamic Education.

All the centres are situated in Kuala Lumpur, Selangor, Johor, Perak and Pulau Pinang. However, the number of centres is not clear. Several centres have closed down due to financial constraints and funding problems from contributors.

In the event of inability to gain access to formal education, alternative education can be given to refugee and undocumented children. It can take place both within and outside education institutions, and cater for persons of all ages. Educational institutions such as NEC can provide these marginalised children with opportunities to receive alternative education in line with the principles of ensuring education for all children irrespective of religion, race or location. In this case the marginalised children may not receive formal recognition of learning attainments although they receive certificates of completion. Alternative education is important for them at least to prepare them to live effectively as community members and to participate in the workplace.

2.5 Summary

The chapter presented an overview of international policies related to AEP which include United Nations Millennium Development Goals, UNESCO’s Education for All, and United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in Asian and Malaysian contexts. The chapter also briefly reviewed AEPs practised in in the region. Apart from the AEP in Kampung Numbak, international bodies and non-governmental organisations also provide AEP for children in plantations in Sabah and Rohingya refugees in Malaysia.
In this section

38 Introduction
38 The context of Kampung Numbak prior to AEP intervention
41 The need for AEP in Kampung Numbak
41 Establishing AEP in Kampung Numbak
41 Summary
3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the situation of the Kampung Numbak children before the establishment of AEP in this community. The children in Kampung Numbak faced difficulties in gaining admission to the mainstream education due to various factors. Therefore, there was a need to provide AEP to this community. With the cooperation from numerous stakeholders, the Kampung Numbak Educare Centre was set up.

3.2 The context of Kampung Numbak prior to AEP intervention

The context of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of this project can be analysed from two perspectives: (a) inherent and (b) peripheral. The Kampung Numbak children faced difficulties in gaining access to education due to two defining factors; (i) their status (ii) the complex procedure of gaining documentation/certification to gain entry into mainstream education. Firstly, status, inherited from their parents' undocumented status becomes a stumbling block in attaining a formal education. The 1996 Education Act clearly states that each child has the right to quality education enabling an individual’s potential for national development (Refer Annex L). However, due to their undocumented status, fees are imposed on these children to access formal education as compared to free education for Malaysian citizens (Refer Annex L). Parents have to give priority to their family needs, and education is largely viewed as a luxury.

Many of these parents are either fishermen or labourers earning between RM 450 – 600 to support eight to ten children per family.

The second factor involves a complex procedure of gaining documentation/certification to access mainstream education (refer Annex I; UNICEF Malaysia: Alternative Education for Refugee and Undocumented Children Project Information Brief, 2011). Undocumented children are able to access mainstream education by applying for a “student card”. However parents are required to be proactive and knowledgeable in navigating through the lengthy application process which could be hampered by the parents’ workload and illiteracy.
These undesirable conducts could lead to a rise in social problems which would affect the well-being of the immediate and extended community. This is noted by authorities as a detriment to the nation’s future prosperity (UNICEF Concept paper 2011-2012, n.d.; UNICEF Malaysia: Alternative Education for Refugee and Undocumented Children Project Information Brief, 2011).

These factors, coupled with poor living conditions in Kampung Numbak shaped children’s behaviour and attitude. The children’s behaviour and attitude before the introduction of Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre project was one of despondence as illustrated below:

Keadaan kanak-kanak disini, itulah saya cakap pada mula itu…kanak-kanak dia terbiar, ada yang bermain, ada yang mandi air masin, lompat sana, lompat sini hari-hari, dia akan berkeliharan yang tidak dapat bersekolah tu… [The condition of the children here, that is why I mentioned before…the children are left by themselves, there are those playing, there are those bathing in the salt water, jumping here, jumping there every day, those who are not schooling will be wandering]

Interview with Mr. Idris, Village Head, 22/2/2013

Kesian dengan…apa…tiada pelajaran…melepak sana sini…lebih lebih lagi ada sampai budak hisap rokok…hisap gam…memang menyedihkan lah… [It’s pitiful for them…without education…playing truant here and there… there are some who are involved in smoking, sniffing glue…it is a sad situation.]

Interview with Mr. Idris, Village Head, 22/2/2013
An area was allocated to allow the construction of a school but due to unstated reasons the school construction did not proceed as planned as the village head mentioned in his interview: -

Not only that, Kampung Numbak was not allocated a KAFA and 3M centre because of limited funding. However, the plight of the community caught the attention of a Korean non-governmental organisation called Food for Hunger, who believed in education equality. With the financial aid and support from the NGO, a premise was set up to provide basic education to the children of Kampung Numbak. The Korean school, as it was popularly known amongst the villagers, operated in Kampung Numbak for a number of years. Unfortunately, the private school closed down due to financial issues. The building could still be seen in the vicinity of Kampung Numbak but little mention was made of the Korean school since NEC was established.

...kampung ini tidak ada sekolah tetapi ia memang ada tapaklah yang dibina oleh kerajaan peruntukan dari kementerian pertahanan. Jadi pada masa itu sekolah ini, tapak sekolah ini terbiarlah... [...this village has no school but the government (Ministry of Defence) has allocated a site. So at that time, the site was left undeveloped...]

Interview with Mr. Idris, Village Head, 22/2/2013
3.3 The need for AEP in Kampung Numbak

The need for an AEP intervention arose due to two main factors. Firstly, the aforementioned inherited status of students and difficulties in gaining access to the mainstream school. Secondly, the existence of a school operated by ‘Food for Hungry’ raised the awareness among community members on the needs for their children to receive some form of formal education.

3.4 Establishing AEP in Kampung Numbak

UNICEF’s global experience shows that out-of-school children are generally at greater risk of exploitation and violence. Many are forced out onto the streets at a much younger age to earn a living, and often experience violence and abuse. Working on the streets, these children are also be easily lured into gangs, exploited by dishonest adults for unscrupulous and unproductive activities such as glue sniffing, gambling and drug peddling.

No plan had hitherto been made to establish a learning institution by the community or local authorities of Kampung Numbak. However, this lack of learning institution caught the attention of UNICEF in 2010. The Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre, a first of its kind initiative by UNICEF in collaboration with Malaysia’s Ministry of Education, the Federal Special Task Force and the Malaysian Teacher Foundation, started off by following a simplified version of the national curriculum, taught by four volunteer teachers from the community.

3.5 Summary

The chapter on relevance reflects on the situation of the underprivileged community and the need for the children to obtain schooling opportunities. The need for an AEP in Kampung Numbak was due to two reasons; firstly, the difficulties in gaining access to mainstream education due to the aforementioned inherited status, and secondly, the awareness of the community in Kampung Numbak of the needs of the children to receive some form of formal education. The situation thus led to the establishment of the Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre.
Effectiveness
4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses on effectiveness of the AEP programme at NEC. The discussions focuses on the development of the education centre, capacity building of human resources, ensuring teachers’ qualifications, procuring teaching resources, supervising and monitoring the programme and the mentor-mentee programme.

4.2 Programme objectives

Effectiveness criteria form the second focus of the assessment exercise and encompass the process in which the AEP is managed in terms of the results of the project. AEP management processes are reviewed based on the questions outlined in Section 1.3.

The objectives of AEP at Kampung Numbak as stipulated in the UNICEF Concept Paper (2010) are to:

i. build a basic education centre for the undocumented children at Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu;
ii. supply teaching aids, textbooks, reference and library books to the centre;
iii. supervise and monitor the programme, and
iv. conduct a mentor-mentee programme to prepare potential students (who would finish school) or members of the community to be teachers.

However, these objectives emphasised on tasks to be conducted and the expected results or outcomes of the project have not been specified in all the documents examined. The aforementioned objectives suggest three planned activities and one management strategy. Thus, to evaluate if the objectives were met on time and as planned, the planned objectives were crosschecked with the scheduled activities outlined in the document statement (UNICEF, 2010; Progress Reports submitted by FSTF to UNICEF in 2011 and 2012).

(a) to build a basic education centre

The centre for undocumented children at Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, NEC was successfully built in 2010 and is currently being used to educate 312 students, ranging from ages 7-14. Further details on the specifics of the centre will be discussed in the subsequent section.

(b) to supply teaching aids, textbooks, reference and library books

In the case of NEC, teaching resources were observed to include materials such as LINUS modules, KBSR textbooks (used), story books for the resource room, and self-made teaching aids. Further discussion and details of teaching resources can be found in the subsequent section.

(c) to supervise and monitor the programme

The task of supervising and monitoring the AEP at NEC is entrusted to MOE. MOE is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring that NEC is managed and operated according to the terms stated in the Concept Paper (UNICEF, undated). Monitoring is carried out by the National Security Council, FSTF and also MTF. UNICEF, the main financial provider, also helped in supervising and monitoring from a distance. The subsequent section details the supervising and monitoring initiatives taken by the stakeholders.

(d) to conduct a mentor-mentee programme to prepare potential students (who would finish school) or members of the community to teach, findings revealed
that attention devoted to this matter lacked the conviction expected. This result may be due to uncertainties surrounding the sustainability of NEC when UNICEF eventually withdraws its financial support.

The next five sections examine the abovementioned components of the AEP project in more detail i.e. building the education centre, ensuring teachers’ qualifications, procuring teaching materials, supervising and monitoring the programme and the mentor-mentee programme.

4.3 Building the education centre

The NEC was established in 2011 at a total cost of RM167,419.56 (FSTF to UNICEF report 2011). NEC includes the following components in its premises - 6 classrooms, a resource centre, a staffroom-cum-office, and 2 toilets. The 6 classrooms are fully utilized for teaching and learning - the classes being equipped with tables, chairs, a whiteboard and ceiling fans, while the staff room has a desktop and printer. The centre, however, does not have a canteen to provide refreshments and snacks for the teachers or students. Food and beverages are sold from a makeshift stall in the centre which is operated by a parent (Madam Susan).

Based on the UNICEF concept paper (2010), NEC is estimated to cater for 300 undocumented children with two schooling sessions. The centre adopts a special AEP curriculum designed by the Ministry of Education with emphasis on the 3Rs (Reading, Writing and Arithmetic skills), Malaysia Studies (civics and citizenship studies, including values and identity development) and Fardu Ain (Islamic religious knowledge and practices). Observation revealed however, that there are insufficient tables and chairs for all the registered students at the centre. An inventory of the major facilities in the centre was performed as shown in Table 4.1 below, and it was found that the total number of tables and chairs available was only 150 and 190 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Chairs</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Table</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Table</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteboard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book shelves</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of students registered at the centre in 2013 was 312. The shortage of requisite facilities such as tables and chairs is a cause for concern and may have repercussions on the students’ cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development. Two classes were observed to be devoid of any tables and chairs during the period of observation. The room was seen to be over-crowded and students may have experienced difficulty in following the class as a result.
Findings from interviews with teachers at the centre showed that the teachers are generally satisfied with the learning centre. The head teacher, Teacher Aminah, affirms that she is satisfied with the learning centre and the facilities provided. Her only lament is the poor maintenance of some of the facilities at the centre. She cited the case of the malfunctioning toilet door, which despite numerous complaints, is yet to be repaired. Other teachers echo the sentiment of the head teacher and are grateful for the facilities provided, but are hopeful for better provision of basic facilities such as adequate tables, chairs, books and audio-visual aids. Teacher Bahari was hopeful for the procurement of an audio-visual (AV) room to enhance students’ learning experience.

With regards to the running of the centre, it should be pointed out that, the problem of overcrowding would not have arisen if the centre had operated using the recommended double schooling sessions i.e. with the first session in the morning (7.30-10.30 AM) and the second in the afternoon (1.30-4.30 PM). Field notes, along with interview and observation data revealed that the daily schooling session was only conducted during the morning, between 7.30 – 11.30 PM. When questioned on the modus operandi of the school, teachers cited a number of reasons for operating only a single session. The most often cited reason was the meagre salary: a salary of RM600.00 per month was seen as insufficient to plan, teach, and manage the school efficiently. Teachers cited the need for a second job in the afternoon to help them to make ends meet as well as needing time at home for their own children. For example, Teacher Aminah
complained that her salary of RM600 per month is much lower than that of a teacher in a government school. She expressed her hope that there may be some revision of salary to increase the salary to RM1000 a month.

4.3.1 Programme enrolment
Since the establishment of the NEC, villagers have shown a positive response to the school. A total of 400 students registered to attend the school. After selection, 220 children joined the school. Only children who were non-citizens without any proper identity documents were selected and accepted for enrolment.

Enrolment in the school increased by 11.1% from 225 students in 2011 to 250 students in 2012. Enrolment in 2013 increased slightly by 22.4% to 306 students. The enrolment in NEC is shown in Table 4.2.

### Table 4.2 THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN NEC 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MINIMUM ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>MAXIMUM ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>AVERAGE ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview with Teacher Aminah, 19/3/2013

The ethnicity breakdown of the students is shown in Table 4.3. The Bajau community forms the largest group of students (55.2%), followed by Suluk (24.0%), and Kagayaan (18.4%). A further 2.4% are made up of students from other ethnic groups.

### Table 4.3 ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF STUDENTS IN NEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bajau</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suluk</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagayaan</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre Records

4.3.2 Curriculum implementation
The pilot AEP at Kampung Numbak follows a special curriculum designed by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (UNICEF Concept paper 2011). The curriculum focused on developing the 3Rs, which include basic literacy and numeracy, Malaysia Studies (civics and citizenship studies, including values and identity development) and Fardu Ain (Islamic religious knowledge and practices). In addition to learning the curriculum content, emphasis was put on ensuring students in Kampung Numbak acquire basic vocational skills through a skills-based training programme, so that they would later be able to use the skills to find jobs and to earn a living. The main subjects taught in NEC were: Bahasa Malaysia, Mathematics, Civics, Islamic Knowledge, Physical Education and Health Education, while the skills-based training included handycrafting.
When questioned about what they had gained from the programme, the majority of students said that they learned letters of the alphabet, basic literacy and numeracy, as well as studying civic and citizenship, religion, the reciting of prayers and healthy eating and living. In addition, the students also said they participated in activities such as singing, choir, sports, drawing, cleaning and beautifying classes.

According to Madam Nor Fariza and Mr. Amzan from MOE, there were high expectations from the parents and students of Kampung Numbak community for the AEP programme in terms of academic studies. However, MOE officials reiterated that the AEP curriculum should also emphas vocational aspects so that graduates of the programme could master some simple living skills to earn a living.

### 4.4 Ensuring teachers’ qualifications

In 2011, six teachers were appointed to teach in the schools. The teachers, aged 20 to 45 years old, came from Kampung Numbak itself. All of the six teachers received training provided by the MOE. However, two male teachers left the school in 2012 and two new teachers joined the school in 2013.

The criteria of the teachers as advertised for positions in NEC are as follows:

- holds a Malaysian citizenship
- is between 18 to 60 years of age
- is healthy (requires verification from government hospital)
- holds a Malaysian Certificate of Education (SPM)

Four teachers possessed SPM certificates. However, the two new teachers possessed only Penilaian Menengah Rendah (Lower Secondary Assessment, PMR) Certificate and had not received any formal teacher training. Both of them were appointed as attachment teachers (guru sandaran). One of these attachment teachers was given a lower pay of RM 450 while the other RM200, which is lower than RM600 paid to other teachers.

As of March 2013, only the four teachers, including the head teacher, had received some form of teacher training, which will be elaborated in the following section.

### 4.5 Capacity building of human resources

Capacity building of human resources encompasses issues related to development in knowledge, management and skills training of the teachers and support staff.

To ensure teachers at NEC were competent to carry out expected teaching tasks, a number of measures were undertaken to upgrade the teachers’ qualifications. At the inception phase of the centre, the MOE, through its Teachers’ Training Division, commissioned the Kent Teachers’ Training Institute, Tuaran, Sabah to conduct a three-day short training course (20-22 January 2011) for the teachers to ensure that the operation of NEC would be run efficiently. Following that, a series of centralized
teacher training courses were organized for all the teachers from various AEP centres, including that of Kampung Numbak by the same teacher training institute.

The teacher training courses involved three main aspects, namely teacher professionalism, teaching and learning skills and knowledge, conduct at assembly and co-curriculum. The training not only comprised teaching skills but also involved motivational sessions and how to run the school administration. Furthermore, the Education Planning and Research Division (EPRD) conducted a three-day short training for the teachers to be trained on the operation and management of NEC. Content of the training modules are shown in Table 4.4.

Based on data obtained from interviews, most of the teachers at NEC, who had been selected to undergo these short courses, felt that the training provided was helpful in improving their pedagogical skills and classroom management skills, especially in the handling of problematic students. Teacher Fatin for example, attests that after the training, she is better able to control her class, and is a more effective teacher. As a result of the training she was able to conduct more activities for her students, including scientific experiments and using learning tools to teach Bahasa Malaysia.

### TABLE 4.4 TEACHER TRAINING MODULE FOR AEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher professionalism</strong></td>
<td>• Values and characteristics of a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers’ ethics and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children psychological, physical and behavioural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Counselling and psychotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stress management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues and challenges in current education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovations and changes in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher professionalism-related legalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emotion intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and learning skills and knowledge</strong></td>
<td>• Developing teaching and learning materials (recyclable and non-recyclable items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Literacy and Numeracy Screening (LINUS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Checking exam scripts and students’ work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current teaching and learning models (Constructivism, mastery learning, Out-of-class learning, Contextual learning, Cooperative learning, Play pedagogy, project-based learning, problem-based learning, Using ICT, Innovation in teaching and learning, Tests and assessments, Reflective practice and self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conduct at assembly</strong></td>
<td>• Singing national anthem and state anthem, Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ performance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Speech and announcement delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National Ideology (Rukun Negara) recitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-curriculum</strong></td>
<td>• Planning, implementing, managing and evaluating co-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Procuring teaching resources

NEC was furnished with relevant teaching aids, textbooks, reference books and library books provided by MOE Malaysia. Table 4.5 shows a total of 3756 textbooks provided to the centre. These textbooks are the used and obsolete textbooks adopted during the Primary School Integrated Curriculum. MOE was responsible for collecting and distributing these textbooks to the Centre.

As can be seen the number of textbooks given is not commensurate with the number of students registered in the centre. Furthermore, the number of books provided is not balanced with class numbers, some sets being in excess of the number needed while others are lacking. This has given rise to students having to share textbooks in their classes.

Teaching aids were insufficiently provided for by MOE, but teachers have created some teaching aids to be used in their classes. It was observed that some of the teachers recycled materials such as plastic bottles to use as realia in their classes. AEP collaborators such as FSTF also procured some materials to be used for skills training classes (FSTF to UNICEF report 2011). Based on observation, teaching aids, both in printed form and electronic form, are in short supply and this issue needs urgently to be addressed. In several classrooms, it was found that the main teaching aids used were the whiteboard and textbooks. In all the classes observed the dominant approach used was a teacher-fronted locked-step approach. Few teaching aids were used to support learning. A poignant instance was when a hearing impaired child was seen to be trying his hardest to follow the lesson. The teacher helped by using some sign language and hand gestures to explain, yet the child’s exasperated facial expression suggested a lack of comprehension. Sufficient teaching aids would be of great benefit to both teachers and students in this instance and in general as seen in Teacher Ida’s lament about the need for more teaching aids.

TABLE 4.5 TEXTBOOKS IN CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXTBOOKS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Melayu Tahun 2 Jilid 1</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Melayu Tahun 2 Jilid 2</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Year 2 Part 1</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Year 2 Part 2</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan Islam Tahun 2 Jilid 1</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan Islam Tahun 2 Jilid 2</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Year 2</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Textbooks Year 2</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan Jasmani dan kesihatan</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan Moral</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Arab Tahun 2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Year 1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Year 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan Islam Tahun 1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Melayu Tahun 1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Jawi Tahun 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews indicated that there were mixed reactions from teachers at the centre regarding resources - some being content while others are dissatisfied. Some feel their needs are not being met e.g. Teacher Ida said she is not adequately satisfied with the resources.

On the other hand, when probed on this issue, the head teacher (Teacher Aminah) said that NEC is good compared with other refugee schools due to the fact that they are given books from MOE and other teaching equipment.

In the case of reference and library books, it was observed that the library was stocked with used textbooks and old story books. There were five bookracks in the library and four of the five bookracks were filled with books. A large pile of textbooks was observed on the floor of the library indicating that the room functioned more as a storeroom for the students to collect and return their borrowed textbooks than an actual library.
4.7 Supervising and monitoring the programme

Based on findings from the data sources (FGD, document analysis, observation and interviews), FSTF thus far has been seen to play an instrumental role in supervising and monitoring NEC. According to Datuk Suhaimi, the Director of FSTF, FSTF played an intermediary role and functioned as the main conduit between the MOE, UNICEF and the community at NEC. For instance, FSTF helped in collecting and sending reference materials and textbooks solicited from the Textbook Division to NEC. Funding provided by UNICEF has been channelled through the FSTF to the community in the form of salary for the head teacher and teachers and operating expenses of the centre. At the same time, any concerns of the community were processed and reported to the relevant stakeholders during meetings.

Besides the FSTF, the MOE also played an important role in supervising and monitoring the AEP in NEC. Based on interview data obtained through the Department of Educational Policy and Research (ERPD), MOE was seen to function as the main referral point and stakeholder in the project. ERPD was deemed as the most appropriate division to undertake the position because the AEP at NEC is still at the pilot phase of implementation. Besides ERPD, other divisions in the MOE such as the Curriculum Development Division, Textbook Division, and Teachers’ Training Division, also assisted in the supervision and monitoring of the project. The Curriculum Division helped in refining the AEP curriculum, the Textbook Division collaborated by means of providing reference and textbooks and the Teacher Training Division participated in providing training to the teachers of NEC.

Malaysian Teachers’ Foundation (MTF), also participated in the initial planning, implementation and sponsorship of the project. However, MTF’s role and influence started to diminish in 2011. The Sabah State Education Department (SSED) only played a minimal role in the supervision and monitoring activities, however, they contributed textbooks to the NEC.

4.8 Mentor-mentee programme

NEC started its operations in 2011 with five teachers and a head teacher. A year after the initiation of the programme, however, the head teacher had resigned, along with another teacher who found more lucrative positions elsewhere. The centre now operates with four salaried teachers, a volunteer teacher and a half-salaried teacher including the head teacher, Teacher Aminah, to teach the six classes running at the centre. In event that one of the four teachers is absent, a temporary teacher (Teacher Ena) is assigned to substitute. The temporary teacher is a graduate of the AEP at NEC who completed her study in 2012, and as such, can be seen as a positive outcome of the mentor-mentee programme. On the basis of the above findings, it can be surmised that the main objectives were met.

4.9 Summary

The following table summarizes the planned objectives and the activities that were undertaken:

Objectives i, ii, and iii have been satisfactorily met. Objective iv, however, appears to be only marginally met, as there are no structured mechanisms in place.
## TABLE 4.6 PLANNED OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN</th>
<th>DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.  Build a basic education centre for the undocumented children at Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu (UNICEF, FSTF)</td>
<td>Successful construction of NEC in 2010.</td>
<td>Completed in August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Supply teaching aids, textbooks, reference and library books to the centre</td>
<td>Provided teaching and learning materials for NEC – i.e., textbooks, story books, references, and teaching aids</td>
<td>Completed in September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Supervise and monitor the programme</td>
<td>Supervising and Monitoring 1 &amp; 2 (MTF, MOE, Coordinator, FSTF, and UNICEF)</td>
<td>November 2010 (FSTF Concept paper to UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOE continues to support the programme by supplying textbooks and reference books, and providing special teacher training for AEP teachers.</td>
<td>Jan-Oct 2012 (FSTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.  Conduct a mentor-mentee programme to prepare potential students (who would finish school) or members of the community to be teachers</td>
<td>Teacher Aminah talks of a plan to earmark potential students to be trained as teachers for NEC E.g. Miss Ena</td>
<td>No documentation of plans or mechanisms on paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicate, however, that some initiatives were taken by the head teacher towards that end of the programme, such as the appointment of a substitute teacher to relieve any of the six teachers who may be on sick leave; and recruitment of new teachers (e.g. Teacher Bahari and Teacher Ina).

The construction of the centre and the facilities provided has helped sustain NEC up to the present. However, monitoring and supervision could be further improved, particularly in relation to empowering the local community to take charge of the centre. Data derived from field observation and document analysis show that further plans to sustain the project beyond the pilot phase (2011-2013) are needed for the centre to continue.

The chapter on effectiveness was presented with the intention to evaluate the effectiveness of implementation of AEP in relation to a number of questions, namely, programme’s objectives, components, capacity building, enrolment, and curriculum implementation. The students’ learning performance which might further show the effectiveness of the programme will be presented in the Chapter 6, Outcomes.

Objectives linked to effectiveness of building a basic education centre; procuring of teaching resources, textbooks, and teaching aids; supervision and monitoring of the programme were largely met. Firstly, NEC was successfully built; teaching resources, textbooks and teaching aids were provided; and the programme was appropriately monitored and supervised. In this respect, all stakeholders, particularly UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, and MTF have played their roles in getting the NEC off the ground. Although there are shortcomings in terms of the lack
of adequacy and relevancy of teaching resources and the absence of a systematic mentor-mentee programme for capacity development, NEC appears to have satisfactorily achieved all objectives of its establishment.

In relation to teacher training and capacity building for the teaching staff in NEC, it was found that objectives were only partially met. Efforts thus far seemed rather tepid and it appears the responsible stakeholders such as the MOE and MTF who are in charge of teacher training and development, have to look into these issues more seriously.

In the case of student enrolment in the centre, the progressive increment in enrolment augurs well for acceptability and increasing importance of NEC. However, investigation on issues related to teaching and learning implementation did reveal some shortcomings. The basic AEP curriculum model implemented at NEC lacked comprehensiveness and fell short of the MDG’s recommendation of a full course primary schooling of five years. This issue, however, has been acknowledged by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia and an improved and a more comprehensive version of the curriculum has since been developed in 2012 (see further discussion in Chapter 7 - Sustainability and Scale Up). The improved model, however, is not evaluated in this study.

Overall, the special AEP curriculum implemented in NEC has recorded an impressive increase in all areas of curriculum taught: (1) Literacy and numeracy, (2) KAFA, (3) Life skills, (4) Civics and citizenship, and (5) Character development, implying that the students have improved their knowledge, skills and practices in these areas. Thus, it can be concluded that the NEC and the pilot AEP curriculum have contributed positively towards attaining the goals of the project.
In this section

58 Introduction
58 The planned roles of stakeholders
58 The actual roles of stakeholders
59 Comparison of planned and actual roles
61 The roles of NEC
62 The roles of the community
62 Supervision, monitoring and information sharing
63 Programme investment
64 Expenditure per capita
66 Issues and concerns in the implementation of NEC
67 Summary
5.1 Introduction

The chapter details the second criteria of the assessment - efficiency. Firstly, the planned and actual roles of the stakeholders are described, followed by a comparison to show to the congruency of the roles. The next two sections describe the roles of the school and the community respectively. This is followed by details of efficiency of the supervision, monitoring and information-sharing aspects of the programme. This chapter also details the investment involved in the programme. The final section describes the issues and concerns in implementing the programme.

5.2 The planned roles of stakeholders

The main stakeholders involved in the AEP at NEC were UNICEF, MOE, FSTF and MTF. The UNICEF concept paper (2011-2012) details the planned roles of each stakeholder. The planned roles of UNICEF in the programme were to advocate for and facilitate the programme, provide funding for the programme and assist in a rolling plan for NEC and other related activities.

MOE was assigned to provide advice, facilitate the programme planning and implementation, supervise and monitor the activities and assist in the financial administration of the programme. MOE was also assigned to provide training to the teachers (including teachers from similar centres) as well as to assist in providing health education, skills-based training and vocational skills training for the students of the centre.

FSTF was tasked to manage the financial accounts of the programme, appoint teachers for the centre and ensure the security and safety of the students, teachers and the local community. FSTF was also assigned to assist in the operation of the centre, delivery of the textbooks and teaching aids and ensure periodic maintenance of the centre.

The planned roles of SSED in the programme were to assist MOE in the supervision and monitoring activities at micro level and other related activities. SSED was also assigned to contribute textbooks to NEC.

The planned roles of MTF in the programme were to assist MOE, FSTF and UNICEF in the implementation of the programme, assist MOE in teacher training programme, assist in procuring extra funding and teaching materials for the project and donate funding for NEC through FSTF.

5.3 The actual roles of stakeholders

Being the main stakeholder, UNICEF advocated for and facilitated the pilot AEP in Kampung Numbak. UNICEF was also the only funder for the programme. It also assisted in designing and implementing the rolling plan of the centre and also other related activities.

MOE undertook the activities of curriculum development, provision of textbooks and teacher training. It also planned the teaching and learning syllabus and supervised the activities organised. MOE, through Institut Pendidikan Guru Kampus Kent, also provided training for NEC teachers. To date, two short-term training sessions have been organised since the inception of NEC, in 2011 and 2012. The delivery of textbooks to the NEC was done by SSED.

FSTF served three main functions. Firstly, FSTF facilitated the access of other stakeholders into the Kampung Numbak community. Secondly, FSTF coordinated support and assistance between MOE and NEC in distributing textbooks and organising short-term training courses for the teachers. Thirdly, FSTF also coordinated the distribution of funds from UNICEF to NEC. Finally, FSTF facilitated teacher recruitment and management of NEC.
MTF contributed in providing desks and chairs to NEC. They also provided uniforms to a large number of students at NEC. MTF also managed and monitored the implementation of the program regularly and reported NEC development to UNICEF and MOE.

5.4 Comparison of planned and actual roles

UNICEF, MOE, MTF and FSTF have played their roles in ensuring the success of NEC implementation since the initiation of the project. These organisations worked together according to their designated roles. FSTF provided help whenever the organisations needed their assistance in terms of suggestions and information about NEC, as the nearest point of contact. UNICEF played its role to advocate for and facilitate the project, and finance the NEC project. Apart from that, UNICEF also helped in terms of media coverage during the opening ceremony of the NEC project. They also interviewed students to make a documentary of the project. As a summary, Table 5.1 shows a comparison of the planned and actual roles for each stakeholder.

### Table 5.1 Comparison of Planned and Actual Roles of Each Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>PLANNED ROLES</th>
<th>ACTUAL ROLES</th>
<th>REMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Advocate for and facilitate the program</td>
<td>Facilitated the program</td>
<td>Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted site visits to the centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Held discussion and meetings with FSTF during their site visit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide funding for the program</td>
<td>Provided a total of RM 553,838.00 for NEC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in the rolling plan of the centre and also other related activities</td>
<td>Assisted in the rolling plan of NEC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helped in terms of media coverage during the opening ceremony of the NEC project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Made a documentary of student progress and interviewed students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Provide advice and facilitate the program planning and implementation</td>
<td>Provided advice to the teachers especially in teaching and learning during their site visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitated the program planning and implementation especially to serve the needs of AEP at NEC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervise and monitor the activities</td>
<td>Made frequent visits to NEC.</td>
<td>The presence of MOE is the most frequent among all the stakeholders, apart from FSTF. Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitored and coordinated activities at NEC, e.g. the LINUS assessment and NEC curriculum implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervised and monitored activities at NEC at least once a month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAKEHOLDERS</td>
<td>PLANNED ROLES</td>
<td>ACTUAL ROLES</td>
<td>REMARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Provide training to teachers (including all the teachers from similar centres)</td>
<td>Provided and coordinated training to NEC teachers and to all the teachers from similar centres</td>
<td>Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in providing health education as well as skill-based training and vocational skills for the students of the centre</td>
<td>Assisted in organizing the skill-based training and vocational skills for teachers and Year six students at NEC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in the financial administration of the program</td>
<td>Assisted in the financial administration of the program whereby RM 368,058.00 was channeled to them by UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSTF</td>
<td>Manage the financial accounts of the program</td>
<td>Managed the financial accounts of the program. UNICEF allocated the amount of RM185,780.00 to FSTF.</td>
<td>Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint teachers for the education centre</td>
<td>Appointed teachers for the education centre. This was done through the job advertisement at NEC and interviews of qualified applicants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the security and safety of the students, teachers and also the local community</td>
<td>Ensured the security and safety of students, teachers and also the local community. Assisted to manage the operation of the centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in the operation of the centre</td>
<td>Assisted to manage the operation of the centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in the delivery of textbooks and teaching aids</td>
<td>Assisted in the delivery of textbooks. SSED provided the textbooks to FSTF and FSTF delivered the textbooks to NEC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the periodic maintenance of the centre</td>
<td>Ensured the periodic maintenance of the centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSED</td>
<td>Assist MOE in the supervision and monitoring activities at micro level and other related activities</td>
<td>Has played a minimal role in the supervision and monitoring activities at micro level and other related activities.</td>
<td>Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute textbooks to NEC</td>
<td>Contributed textbooks to NEC through FSTF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>Assist MOE, FSTF and UNICEF in the implementation of the project</td>
<td>Assisted MOE, FSTF and UNICEF in the implementation of the project especially during the initiation of the project</td>
<td>Congruency of planned and actual roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist MOE in teacher training program</td>
<td>Was not involved in the teacher training program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in procuring extra funding and teaching materials for the project</td>
<td>Has not assisted in procuring extra funding and teaching materials for the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donate funding for NEC through FSTF</td>
<td>Has not donated funding for NEC through FSTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 The roles of NEC

The centre functioned as an agent of change to the community in Kampung Numbak. The centre encouraged religious practice among the students and the villagers by way of organising religious event such as *Khatam Al-Quran*. The *Khatam Al-Quran*, held in 2012, was co-organised by NEC and FSTF. The event participants included centre students, parents, villagers and FSTF officers. The centre also taught religious rules.

...guru-guru telah menyelitkan mata pelajaran agama, terutama agama...anak-anak mereka pun pandai pergi ke surau, sembayang, mengaji [...] teachers integrate religious knowledge in the lesson... children start going to mosque, praying and reciting]

Interview with the Head Teacher – Teacher Aminah, 20/2/2013

The centre also made an effort to change the students’ attitude by instilling values such as cleanliness, personal hygiene and health, and a sense of ownership through routines practised in the centre. Students were assigned with duties to ensure the cleanliness of centre. Personal hygiene was also instilled through singing rhymes in the lessons. In this way, students were directly involved in maintaining a conducive learning environment. Similarly, through outdoor activities such as Physical Education, students learned about the importance of exercise for personal health.

...kadang 1 minggu satu kali melalui pelajaran PJK...dalam belajar PJK itu, dapat menjaga kesihatan badan senaman kan. [...] once in a week...in the Physical Education lesson, they learn to take care of their health through exercising.]

Interview with Teacher Ida, 20/2/2013

The activities done by NEC helped in shaping students’ character. Students were randomly assigned to lead the recitation of the ‘*Rukun Negara*’ (National Ideology) and prayer. The centre provided opportunities to inculcate teamwork and cooperation through outdoor events such as telematches and communal work. The centre also facilitated the development of a sense of citizenship in the students. In daily assembly, the national anthem, *Negaraku*, and the state anthem, *Sabah Tanah Airku*, were sung. These activities were carried out to instil a sense of allegiance to Malaysia.

Melalui perhimpunan pun kami akan menerapkan macam disiplin... membuat barisan yang lurus... yang melalui begitu pun ada sedikit sumbangan untuk membentuk sahsiah diri itu... macam dengar arahan... beri kerjasama kepada guru... [ The students learn about discipline during assembly... queuing in lines... it helps in character-building... following instructions... cooperate with the teachers...]

Interview with Teacher Ida, 20/2/2013

In addition, the centre functioned as an educational channel of literacy and numeracy, and basic
5.6 The roles of the community

Parents and the Kampung Numbak community provided support to the centre in four ways. Firstly, they provided centre uniforms for the children. Secondly, parents provided centre fees and raised funds for centre expenses. Thirdly, parents helped to monitor their children’s learning progress and discipline (Interview with Miss Lijahwati, FSTF, 20/3/2013). Finally, parents provided support for students at any activities conducted by FSTF, MOE and UNICEF.

In addition, the community functioned as motivator to both the teachers and students. The support given by parents, students and the village head encouraged teachers to serve continuously in the centre, albeit facing numerous challenges.

5.7 Supervision, monitoring and information sharing

FSTF reported that supervision of this project was done twice a month through meetings and site visits. During these meetings with teachers and parents, issues and problems were brought up for discussion and solutions were sought. FSTF also visited NEC to monitor the operation of the centre. Reports were submitted to the Director of FSTF after each meeting or visit.

Supervision by MOE was done once a month to provide advice and distribute teaching and learning materials to teachers. To date, MOE has conducted twenty visits and eleven meetings with NEC (refer Annex J). In one of the visits, MOE administered the LINUS examination. There was no written report provided to the research team regarding the supervision, monitoring and information sharing conducted by MOE. The written report of supervision, monitoring and information sharing from FSTF also could not be accessed due to its status as classified files.
Macam EPRD tu memang ada turun membuat penyeliaan dan kekerapan meeting dalam sekali sebulan. Pengisian mereka akan buat ujian LINUS dan memberi khidmat nasihat kepada guru-guru bagaimana menangani masalah pelajar... Kebanyakannya, mereka turun untuk melawat saja sebab ada kerja di tempat lain di sabah [EPRD supervises and conducts meetings once a month. They administer the LINUS test, and advises the teachers on how to handle student’s problems. Most of the time they come to visit the centre only because they have other duties at other places in Sabah]

Interview with Mr. Malai Fazlan Aswad, 23/5/2013

Information sharing among FSTF, MOE and NEC was done through meetings, written progress reports and emails. From this information, FSTF regularly informed UNICEF via reports on the problems faced and activities done.

5.8 Programme investment

This section explains and compares the budget, allocation of funding and the actual expenditure of the programme. Aspects involved in the programme were teachers’ salary, monitoring and evaluation, teacher training, meetings, skill-based training and operational expenses of NEC.
5.8.1 Allocation of funding
UNICEF allocated RM422,715.16 to fund the programme since 2010. The total amount included refurbishment costs of the education center.

5.8.2 Budget
The budget for the programme for 2011 and 2012 is summarised in Table 5.2.

The 2011 budget (RM139,410) in descending proportion, consisted of teachers’ salary RM43,200 (30.9%), monitoring and evaluation RM36,350 (26.1%) and operational expenses of centre RM10,200 (7.3%).

With an addition of RM23,100, the budget for 2012 increased to RM162,510. The budget, in descending proportion, consisted of teacher salary RM43,200 (26.6%), skills based training program RM39,600 (24.4%) and operational expenses RM10,200 (6.3%). The increment of 16.6% in 2012 was associated with the introduction of the teaching of living skills such as bag knitting and paper crafting.

---

### TABLE 5.2 PROGRAMME BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PORTION / ITEM</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ Salary</td>
<td>RM 43,200</td>
<td>RM 43,200</td>
<td>RM 86,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>RM 36,350</td>
<td>RM 36,350</td>
<td>RM 72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>RM 20,560</td>
<td>RM 20,560</td>
<td>RM 41,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>RM 12,600</td>
<td>RM 12,600</td>
<td>RM 25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Based Training</td>
<td>RM 16,500</td>
<td>RM 39,600</td>
<td>RM 56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Expenses of Centre</td>
<td>RM 10,200</td>
<td>RM 10,200</td>
<td>RM 20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RM 139,410</td>
<td>RM 162,510</td>
<td>RM 301,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF concept paper of Education for Undocumented Children in Malaysia

5.9 Expenditure per capita

This section provides a comparison of expenditure per capita in 2011 and 2012. The first part details the planned and actual expenditure for teaching a student in NEC. The second part details the planned and actual expenditure for training one teacher at NEC.

5.9.1 Comparison of budget and actual expenditure per student

A comparison of the budget and actual expenditure per student is shown in Table 5.5.

As shown in Table 5.5, the planned expenditure for teaching a child in NEC for a year in the centre was RM619.60 in 2011. However, the actual expenditure
5.9.2 Comparison of budget and actual expenditure per teacher

The planned expenditure for training one teacher in 2011 and 2012 was RM3,426.67 each. However, the actual expenditure for training one teacher in 2011 and 2012 was RM357.14, 10.42% each. Table 5.6 summarizes the planned and actual expenditure for training one teacher in NEC. The marked reduction of expenditure per teacher was due to the spending of the allocated amount of RM15,000.00 for 42 teachers across 13 centres in Sabah, instead of the six teachers in NEC.

### TABLE 5.3  BUDGET AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE PER STUDENT AT NEC IN 2011 AND 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PLANNED EXPENDITURE*</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE**</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>RM 619.60</td>
<td>RM 139,410 / 225</td>
<td>RM 667.20</td>
<td>RM 150,119.50 / 225</td>
<td>107.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>RM 671.53</td>
<td>RM 162,510 / 242</td>
<td>RM 394.94</td>
<td>RM 95,576.10 / 242</td>
<td>58.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNICEF concept paper education for undocumented children in Malaysia, 2011-2012 (all budget excluding building cost)

**Source: Interview with Miss Lijahwati, FSTF, 20/3/2013 (all budget excluding building cost)

was RM667.20, which was 107.68% of the planned expenditure. The planned expenditure for a child in NEC for the year of 2012 was RM671.53. However, the actual expenditure for teaching a child in NEC was RM394.94 or 58.80% of the planned expenditure. The actual expenditure for 2011 was higher than that of 2012 due to an amount spent on monitoring and evaluation, which was not spent in 2012. According to Osman and Rajah (2011), the approximate cost for teaching one child in Malaysia for one year is RM1,782.00. This shows that the expenditure for teaching one child in NEC for one year is lower than the expenditure for teaching a child in mainstream schools in Malaysia for one year.

### TABLE 5.4 PLANNED AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE COMPARISON PER TEACHER AT NEC ACCORDING TO THE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PLANNED EXPENDITURE*</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE**</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>RM 3,426.67</td>
<td>RM 20,560 / 6 teachers in NEC</td>
<td>RM 357.14</td>
<td>RM 15,000 / 42 teachers from 13 centres</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>RM 3,426.67</td>
<td>RM 20,560 / 6 teachers in NEC</td>
<td>RM 357.14</td>
<td>RM 15,000 / 42 teachers from 13 centres</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNICEF concept paper education for undocumented children in Malaysia, 2010

**Source: Interview with Miss Lijahwati, FSTF, 20/3/2013
5.10 Issues and concerns in the implementation of NEC

The major challenge faced in the implementation of NEC was the lack of good classroom equipment such as desks and chairs for the students. Teacher Fatin and Teacher Ida complained about the lack of desks and chairs and the poor conditions of those that were available.

The second challenge concerned the low salary received by teachers. Teachers at NEC were paid a salary of RM600.00 per month, a sum that is much lower than that of a mainstream teacher in a government school. The head teacher expressed her hope that there might be some revision of salary to increase their salary to RM1000.00 per month. Perhaps, FSTF, who is the stakeholder responsible for the management of the financial accounts of the programme and appointment of teachers at NEC, could look into increasing the salary of the teachers. Another challenge related to financial resources was the insufficient allocation for the students’ activities. The third challenge faced concerned the day-to-day running of the centre such as maintenance of broken doors, broken windows and lack of dustbins. A more recent challenge was installation a grill, with the limited source of electricity prohibiting wielding work from being done.
Another challenge was the lack of systematic documentation in NEC, evidenced in the disorganised record keeping pertaining to assets and human resources of the centre. Systematic procedure for documentation is needed to ensure proper tracking of centre assets and liabilities.

5.11 Summary

The partnership among various governmental and non-governmental agencies contributed to the efficient management of NEC. UNICEF, MOE (including IPG Kent) and FSTF fulfilled their roles as projected prior to the initiation of the programme. However, MTF’s presence in the programme was seen to fade as the programme progressed.

The centre has played its role by efficiently functioning as an agent of change in shaping the behaviour, attitude and values of the students, parents and villagers, as a centre to encourage religious practices among the students and the villagers, and as an educational channel of literacy, numeracy and basic vocational skills.

Within this project, the community could be seen as collaborator of the centre by providing informal education to the students. Community also functioned as motivator to the teachers and students to continuously serve the centre. The Kampung Numbak community also efficiently played their roles by providing school uniforms, fees payment and raising funds for centre expenses. They helped to monitor their children’s learning progress and discipline and provided support for students in all activities conducted by FSTF, MOE and UNICEF.

The actual expenditure for training one teacher in 2011 and 2012 was only RM357.00 which was far less than the amount budgeted for. The actual expenditure in training one teacher was significantly lower than the budget projection in both 2011 and 2012 due to the sharing of the allocated financial resources with many other teachers outside NEC.

Supervision and monitoring was conducted by MOE and FSTF through meetings and visitations. Information sharing was conducted among UNICEF, MOE, FSTF and NEC through meetings, written progress reports and emails.
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6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the outcomes of the pilot AEP project at Kampung Numbak since its inception in January 2011. NEC registered its first success story with the graduation of its pioneering batch of 70 students where they received their graduation certificates during a graduation ceremony in 2012. These certificates, however, do not have any equivalence to any of the qualifications awarded by the Ministry of Education and therefore cannot be used as a basis for enrolment at any level in mainstream schools.

As of March 2013 at the latest count, NEC recorded an enrolment of 312 students. In what follows, this chapter first presents the findings obtained based on the outcomes of the students as the primary beneficiaries. Thereafter, the chapter delineates the unintended outcomes relating to the students, teachers, and Kampung Numbak community members.

The outcomes are clustered as achieved intended outcomes and unintended outcomes. The intended outcomes are those related to the curriculum content i.e. literacy and numeracy, KAFA, life skills, citizenship and character building which are stated in Table 4.5 in Chapter 5. The unintended outcomes are those connected with students, teachers and community which are not related to the curriculum content.

6.2 Changes related to intended outcomes

6.2.1 Learning performance

Learning performance at NEC was measured quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of performance related to outcomes. These results were obtained: (a) quantitatively through a questionnaire consisting of 28 items which was developed by the research team to measure the attainment of students in five areas: (1) Literacy and numeracy, (2) KAFA, (3) Life skills, (4) Civics and citizenship, and (5) Character development. The questionnaire incorporated a proxy pre-test and a post-test, and (b) qualitatively through content analysis involving interviews with students, teachers, parents, and community members. All cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning domains were explored in the explication of the findings.

The main instrument used to measure learning performance quantitatively was a questionnaire that was especially designed for the purpose of this assessment. The results of the NEC curriculum were measured using a questionnaire constructed by the research team based on proxy pre-test design. Based on the curriculum elements described in Chapter X, the questionnaire consists of 28 items which are clustered into five components: (i) Linus, (ii) KAFA skills, (iii) Civics and Citizenship, (iv) Life Skills, and (v) Character Development. In the questionnaire, students were asked to indicate their level of attainment in each of the items before attending the AEP and at the time of responding to the questionnaire. All 171 students of 2011 and 2012 intakes who were present were guided to respond to the items by the researchers and the teachers. The instrument and its components were found to be reliable with the indices of internal consistency (alpha) of between 0.721 and 0.811 (Table 6.1).
Responses on the fixed-response items in the questionnaire were then analysed quantitatively with Quest (Adams and Khoo, 1996), an interactive analysis software based on the Rasch’s model using Item Response Theory. Figure 6.1 shows the fit statistics for all the items in the questionnaire. The figure shows that all except item 2 are fit with the in-fit mean square values of between 0.6 and 1.4 logits.

For qualitative data, the research team used a variety of instruments for data gathering, including interviews and focus group discussions with the various stakeholders involved, classroom observation, field notes, and document analysis.
6.2.1.1 Curriculum achievement

To measure the gains in scores obtained, the means of the proxy pre-test and post-test are compared, and are summarised in Table 6.2 below. As can be seen, the table shows that there is a difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test in all areas. This implies that the students have improved their knowledge, skills and practices in these areas. The effect sizes of the changes indicate that all the changes are large in effect. This means that the increases the knowledge, skills and practices in these areas of outcomes are large in magnitude.

### TABLE 6.2 COMPARISON OF GAIN SCORES BETWEEN CHILDREN OF 2011 AND 2012 INTAKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEVIATION</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN MEANS</th>
<th>EFFECT SIZE</th>
<th>MAGNITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and Numeracy</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.5079</td>
<td>0.47345</td>
<td>1.2353</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.7432</td>
<td>0.35545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.3142</td>
<td>0.35858</td>
<td>1.0587</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.3729</td>
<td>0.54043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAFA</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.3770</td>
<td>0.52472</td>
<td>1.1098</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.4868</td>
<td>0.49349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.7062</td>
<td>0.58601</td>
<td>1.1081</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.8143</td>
<td>0.31190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Development</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.6580</td>
<td>0.45229</td>
<td>1.1352</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.7932</td>
<td>0.31588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.5194</td>
<td>0.33555</td>
<td>1.1236</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>LARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.6430</td>
<td>0.27844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the rate of attainment in each of the areas, the frequencies of each of the responses for the pre-test and post-test are tabulated in Tables 6.5 to 6.9 below. The tables show that for all the items in each of the areas, the frequencies of the response ‘agree (3)’ increase tremendously. These increases are triangulated by the increases in means of the items. This implies that the students have attained large increases in knowledge, skills and practices stated in the items.

A breakdown of the attainment of students in the five respective areas: (1) Literacy and numeracy, (2) KAFA, (3) Life skills, (4) Civics and citizenship, and (5) Character development, triangulated using both quantitative and qualitative findings as presented below.

(a) **Achievement in literacy and numeracy**

A literacy and numeracy test was conducted by MOE in March 2012 (Refer Table 6.3 and
The results show that all the students were partially literate after one year of learning at NEC. However, there are still a number of students who have yet to master literacy and numeracy. The results also show that 65.4% of 168 students who have completed the first year of the programme have mastered literacy skills. The data also show that 68.43% of them have mastered numeracy.

### TABLE 6.3 LEVEL OF MASTERY OF LITERACY SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE

### TABLE 6.4 LEVEL OF MASTERY OF NUMERACY SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE

### TABLE 6.5 COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST OF THE AREAS OF LITERACY AND NUMERACY (LINUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF LINUS</th>
<th>PRE *</th>
<th>POST *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Saya boleh membaca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can speak</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Saya boleh bertutur)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can write</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Saya boleh menulis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can count</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Saya boleh mengira)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = disagree, 2 = not sure, 3 = agree

Being a scaled-down version of the national primary integrated curriculum, literacy and numeracy are the key components of the curriculum in NEC. Table 6.5 shows the frequency and means for improvement of literacy and numeracy. Based on Table 6.5, the results show a tremendous improvement of the basic literacy and numeracy after the children attended NEC. The mean score for reading ability increase from 1.22 to 1.99. Meanwhile, the average LINUS score for speaking, writing and counting show...
an increment from 1.99 to 2.87, 1.42 to 2.84 and 1.40 to 2.70 respectively.

Teachers singled out the ability of the children to read, write and count as the most significant outcomes of the project. They stated that the majority of the students are now able to read, write and calculate.

... tahun lepas majority memang pandai membaca... [the majority of last year students know how to read]

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

... pandai mengira, menulis, membaca... [able to calculate, write and read]

Interview with Teacher Fatin, 20/2/2013

A parent pointed out that the results of this project were significant for the students. Going to the school enabled the children to attain basic literacy. Similar testimony was given by another parent whose child was receiving education in NEC. The parents stated that the children were now able to read and apply literacy skills.
The data shows that the result were similar from multiple points of view (i.e. teachers, parent and students), all showing the students attaining basic literacy and numeracy as a result of this project. The following testimony by the village head summed up the effectiveness of the AEP:

**Kesan dia apabila saya lihat seperti tadi mereka pandai sudah menulis, ada sudah yang pandai mengira dan ada juga yang pandai membaca. Itulah dia punya kesan kalau dibandingkan dengan dulun, sebab budak-budak ini tidak langsung tidak mengenal apa-apa. Kalau sekarang itulah kesan dia... [...]When I look at them, they know how to write, some of them are able to calculate and even read. Those are the effects, compared to the time before this, previously the children do not know anything**

Interview with Mr. Idris, 22/2/2013

(b) Achievement in *Kelas Asas Fardu Ain (KAFA)*

Besides the 3Rs, religious education is also placed as a key component of the curriculum. As can be seen in Table 6.6, there are impressive increases in frequency and mean for acquisition of KAFA skills indicating that the AEP has been effective in helping the children to gain religious knowledge.

Based on Table 6.6, the mean scores for the areas of KAFA skills fall on the scale of disagree before the children attended NEC. The mean scores show an increment from 1.31 to 2.72 for all the areas of KAFA skills. Overall results indicate that there is an increase in their KAFA skills.
Qualitative data from focus group interviews also corroborated with the quantitative findings. For example, some examples of outcomes related to KAFA were highlighted by the head teacher and parents. They reported a positive change in students' attitude due to the inclusion of religious studies, the performing of religious practices such as praying in the mosque or surau, and wearing the tudung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF KAFA SKILLS</th>
<th>PRE *</th>
<th>POST *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARISON OF KAFA SKILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17. I can read the Quran  
(Saya boleh membaca al-Quran) | 129 28 12 1.31 | 20 77 72 2.31 |
| 18. I can say prayers  
(Saya boleh membaca doa) | 120 32 15 1.37 | 11 26 132 2.72 |
| 19. I can pray  
(Saya boleh bersolat) | 115 36 19 1.44 | 14 60 96 2.48 |
| 20. I can perform fasting  
(Saya dapat menjalankan ibadah berpuasa) | 125 27 18 1.37 | 19 58 92 2.43 |

*1 = disagree, 2 = not sure, 3 = agree

Similar accounts of the outcomes of religious studies in the centre were given by the students themselves. Azila, a child with moderate ability and Ismail, a beginner student echoed the opinions of parents and teachers:

_to pray, the girls use tudung and the boys know how to use songkok_

Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

_Membaca agama, membaca doa ... [read the Quran and say prayers]_

Interview with Azila, 20/2/2013

_Membaca, membaca Al-Quran, Sembahyang, baca doa... [reading., reading Al-Quran, praying and reciting prayer]_

Interview with Ismail, 20/2/2013
(c) Achievement in civics and citizenship

Besides religious education, another key component of the curriculum concerns inculcating the children with appropriate civics and citizenship values so that they can become responsible members of the country of domicile, Malaysia. As can be seen in Table 6.7 below, there are impressive increases in frequency and mean for acquisition of civics and citizenship values.

### TABLE 6.7 COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST OF THE AREAS OF CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP</th>
<th>PRE *</th>
<th>POST *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. I love Malaysia</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya mencintai negara Malaysia)</td>
<td>mean 1.75</td>
<td>mean 2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I appreciate efforts done by Malaysia</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya menghargai usaha yang diberikan oleh negara Malaysia)</td>
<td>mean 1.73</td>
<td>mean 2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I recognize myself as a Malaysian</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya menganggap diri saya sebagai rakyat Malaysia)</td>
<td>mean 1.85</td>
<td>mean 2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I like the peaceful and harmony of this village.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya suka kepada keadaan aman dan sejahtera di kampung ini)</td>
<td>mean 1.77</td>
<td>mean 2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I contribute to the peace and harmony of the village.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya menyumbang kepada keadaan aman dan sejahtera di kampung ini)</td>
<td>mean 1.44</td>
<td>mean 2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = disagree, 2 = not sure, 3 = agree

Before the children attended NEC, most of them have low scores in frequency and mean for acquisition of civics and citizenship values. After they attended NEC, the mean scores show an increment from the average of 1.44 to 2.56. Overall, the results indicate there was an increase in their acquisition of civics and citizenship values.

Civics and Citizenship is one of the subjects learnt in NEC, and the the subject has been of particular benefit in guiding the students to distinguish between right and wrong and to be more polite and respectful to the teachers and elders, as pointed out by teachers in the following interview data.

*... mana yang salah mana yang betul lah... [able to distinguish between good and bad]*

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

*Murid-murid pandai beratur, bersopan santun... [Students know how to queue and be polite]*

Interview with Teacher Fatin, 20/2/2013
to care for themselves. Another similar area, which was vital for the children of the village was the increased awareness of the importance of hygiene and cleanliness. Tables 6.8 and 6.9 below show the huge increases in frequency and mean for acquisition of character development and living skills.

(d) Achievement in self-management and living skills

Another important outcome of the children at NEC was the ability to be independent and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.8 COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST OF THE AREAS OF CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARISON OF CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know about healthy food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya mengetahui makanan berkhasiat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I know how to keep myself clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan diri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I know how to keep the school clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan di sekolah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I know how to keep my house clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan di rumah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I appreciate the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya menghargai alam sekitar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I like drawing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya suka dengan aktiviti melukis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I like sports activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya suka mengikuti acara sukan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I like cultural activities like singing and dancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saya suka aktiviti kebudayaan seperti tarian dan nyanyian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = disagree, 2 = not sure, 3 = agree
Based on Table 6.8 and Table 6.9, all items show increment in the mean score except item 15. All the items show an increase from disagree to agree (1.24 to 2.86). Item 15 shows no increment in the mean score because not all the classes in NEC learning weaving skills.

Qualitative data obtained from interviews with teachers likewise supported these change in character development:

... mereka tahu macam mana jaga diri mereka ... [they know how to take care of themselves]

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

... diorang tahu sudah apa yang perlu buat... menjaga kebersihan diorang...diorang tahu apa itu bersih...apa itu kotor... [they know what to do.. Keeping themselves clean.. They know what is clean and dirty]

Interview with Teacher Fatin, 20/2/2013
Besides character development, the centre has also taught them skills to make a living, such as bag-knitting and handicrafts. These important skills along with basic literacy and numeracy would eventually lead to employment, as teachers pointed out in their interview.

...pandai mengait beg...jadi kalau mereka pandai...mereka boleh cari pendapatan... [know how knit a bag...so if they know how, they can make a living]

Interview with Teacher Fatin, 20/2/2013

Setakat yang tertubuh ni pencapaian sudah pandai membaca, mengira, menulis dan ada juga buat latihan dan membuat kraf tangan... [Since then, the achievement is that they are able to read, calculate, write and also doing the excercise and craft-making]

Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

6.2.1.2 Academic achievement across cohorts

To compare the attainment of the children at the point of project initiation, at the end of year one, and at the end of year two, cross-sectional design was used in view of the fact that there was a small window of time for data collection. The difference between post-test and proxy pre-test was computed as the gain score. Table 6.10 shows the comparison of the gain scores of the children of 2011 and 2012 intakes.

The table shows that, overall, the gain score for the 2012 intake was 1.0595 while the gain score of the 2011 intake was 1.2135. The overall gain score of the 2012 intake implies that there is a difference in attainment after one year of implementation, since data collected was conducted after the 2012 intake had undergone one year of schooling at NEC. The comparison of the overall gain scores between 2011 and 2012 shows that the effect size is small. This means that the attainment of the 2011 is more than that of 2012 intake, implying that the attainment at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>COHORT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var (p)</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>EFFECT SIZE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy And Numeracy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.5359</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.1667</td>
<td>0.5409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAFA</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.2127</td>
<td>0.5864</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.0380</td>
<td>0.6056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics And Citizenship</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.1730</td>
<td>0.7053</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.0565</td>
<td>0.6593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.1565</td>
<td>0.5607</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.9808</td>
<td>0.5798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Development</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.2276</td>
<td>0.4560</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.0699</td>
<td>0.5214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.2135</td>
<td>0.3767</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.0595</td>
<td>0.4132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the end of year two was higher than that at end of year one. The comparison of gain scores in each of the areas of outcomes shows that this trend applies to all areas, except Civics and Citizenship.

6.3 Application of knowledge and skills learn from NEC

6.3.1 Application of literacy and numeracy

From interviews with the teachers, parents and villagers, it was evident that through the acquisition of basic literacy skills and counting the children are now able to help their parents fill in some simple particulars of official forms. This shows that through the education given, the children who acquired the skills were able to help their family members, many of whom are illiterate. This proved to be a significant advantage over the group of children who were not involved in the project.

Strong evidence of this change was pointed out by the head teacher, who said that in the past, children in the village could not read at all; but a significant contrast can be seen as the students are equipped now with basic literacy. The head teacher also mentioned that the children attending the AEP at Kampung Numbak became significantly ‘smarter’, meaning that the children who received a basic education have more knowledge than in the past when the same population was largely illiterate.

Faiz, a participant of NEC who is considered more advanced than his peers singled out functional application of literacy and numeracy knowledge and skills as an important advantage due to studying at the centre.
Parents stated that the children can now write basic Jawi as the result of religious subjects taught in school. The children were proactive in reciting prayers and reading the Quran as well as fasting during the holy month of Ramadhan.

Parents also stated that one advantage their educated children now have over their peers is being able to apply basic literacy and numeracy skills in their daily lives (i.e. identifying buses or road signs). They also were able to help their parents recognize where they are going when travelling.

Evidence of the change brought about by religious studies also came from the students. Ismail, a student echoed this: “... membaca, membaca Al-Quran, Sembahyang, baca doa... ” [reading, reading the Al-Quran, praying and reciting prayers ... ].

Parents stated that the children can now write basic Jawi as the result of religious subjects taught in school. The children were proactive in reciting prayers and reading the Quran as well as fasting during the holy month of Ramadhan.

6.3.2 Practice of KAFA

The teaching and learning of KAFA resulted in positive changes of attitude of the children. The children became able to practise acquired religious knowledge in their daily lives. The children’s attitude change was felt to be significant. Awareness towards religious practices has increased among them. The head teacher mentioned that through the teaching of religious subjects, the children now go to the mosque and pray, and wear the tudung whenever they are outside:

---

**Dulu saya masuk sini saya tidak pandai. Mengira pun tidak, membeli barang pun tidak. Saya sekolah sini, saya sudah pandai.** [Before I started school, I did not know anything. I could not even count properly, and I did not know how to buy things. After attending this school, I know how to do all those things]

- Interview with Faiz, 20/2/2013

---

**... setelah ada sekolah ini... guru-guru telah menyelitkan mata pelajaran agama, terutama agama... anak-anak mereka pun pandai pergi ke surau, sembahyang, mengaji, seperti yang cikgu cakap tadi, perempuan pandai pakai tudung, yang lelaki sudah pandai pakai songkok... [... after this school was built, the teachers were able to teach religious subject. Now children go to the mosque to pray. The girls wear ‘tudung’ and the boys already know how to use ‘songkok’ ... ]**

- Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

---

**... sebelum ada sekolah ini...merekatidak tahu langsung membaca, tidak tahu langsung mengira, tidak tahu menghayati alaman...dan sekarang apabila ibu bapa mereka keluar pergi Kolombong satu contoh, anak-anak mereka tu tahu alamat sudah itu...boleh bagi tahu bahawa ini alamat...** [Before this school was built, they did not know how to read, count and appreciate nature.. Now when their parents go out to Kolombong for example, the children know the address. They can tell them about the address... ]

- Interview with Teacher Bahari, 20/2/2013

---

Parents stated that the children can now write basic Jawi as the result of religious subjects taught in school. The children were proactive in reciting prayers and reading the Quran as well as fasting during the holy month of Ramadhan.

**Bagi anak aku memang itu ada. Dia pandai menulis itu Alif Ba Ta, itu dia pandai. Sembahyang pun dia ikut juga. Entahlah mungkin dia sendiri. Puasa pun dia ikut juga ... [My kids know how to write Alif Ba Ta and follow us in praying. My kids also fast on their own accord.]**

- Interview with Madam Sheila, 21/2/2013

---

**Ada juga. Ada sembahyang, ada belajar mengaji. Makan itu pun ada baca doa. Sembahyang sendiri pun ada. Puasa pun dia sendiri mahu. [He prays and recites the Quran. He says a prayer before meals and he prays alone by himself. He also fasts on his own.]**

- Interview with Madam Dorothy, 21/2/2013
6.3.3 Attitudes, civics and citizenship

Changes in attitude and discipline among the students were evident based on interviews with Kampung Numbak teachers. Teachers noted that students are now able to queue up properly, they are more polite and show greater respect to others. Teachers also pointed out that students were more aware of the features of good character and were also more disciplined and more cooperative.

A Kampung Numbak teacher, Intan, cited the gradual behavioural changes of students observable in the decline of undesirable activities (such as glue sniffing and gambling). The children now tend not to waste their time.

One of the villagers emphasised Civics and Citizenship as a subject taught in school which has positively changed the children’s lifestyle, particularly as there are now fewer children to be seen loitering around and playing in dirty areas.

---

... murid-murid pandai beratur, bersopan santun... [... the students know how to queue up and they are polite ...],

Menghormati orang tua dengan guru-guru lah... [respecting the elders and the teachers ... ]

Interview with Teacher Fatin, 20/2/2013

... mereka sudah pandai menghormati antara satu sama lain. Misal kata, terjumpa di jalan “Assalamualaikum” cikgu...selamat pagi mak cik... Assalamualaikum mak cik...sebelum ini tidak ada itu semua...itu saja... [... they know how to respect each other. For example they greet people when they meet them on the road ... ]

Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

... sebab melalui perhimpunan pun kami akan menerapkan nilai disiplin...membuat barisan yang lurus...yang melalui begitu pun ada sedikit sumbangan untuk membentuk sahsiah diri itu... macam dengar arahan... beri kerjasama kepada guru... [... we place emphasis on discipline, even during school assembly. For example, students queue in a straight line. Something like this contributes to the students’ change in attitude. They are able to give cooperation and follow instructions given by the teachers ... ]

Interview with Teacher Ida, 20/2/2013

... dia orang tahu bina diri, dia orang tahu sahsiah diri yang tinggi lah... [students are able to improve themselves, they know what are the characteristics of good personalities... ]

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

Ada [kesan kah tertubuh sekolah ini], budak lebih menghormati orang sesama lain....sudah pandai membaca...kurang sudah budak pergi bermain...seperti hisap gam...bermain judi...ini kesan dia lah...ada kebaikan sikit lah... [After the project, the children respect each other, they are able to read and less playing... And the negative activities also decline... ]

Interview with Teacher Intan, 20/2/2013

... ada yang bermain, ada yang mandi air masin, lompat sana, lompat sini hari-hari,dia akan berkeliaran yang tidak dapat bersekolah tu, itulah yang saya dapat lihat pada tahun 2007 hingga 2010. Jadi apabila wujudnya sekolah ini, apa yang saya lihat budak-budak ni dia dapat pertama dia dapat menyenaiakan diri... [... children played in the sea and loitered around the village because they were not going to school. That was what I observed from 2007 to 2010. When the school has been established, the children can get used to it... ]

Interview with Head Village, 22/2/2013
6.3.4 Self-management and independence

The head teacher was of the opinion that the children have made improvements in taking care of their personal hygiene and presentation. In the past the children were less able to look after their own cleanliness. A significant change in the children's discipline and mindset regarding self-care was observed.

Outside of the school, children were also seen to demonstrate new behaviours relating to their lifestyle, specifically becoming more independent from their families. They are now able to perform daily activities without any assistance from their parents and have also became more aware of personal hygiene, as a result of learning experiences in the centre.

Lifestyle changes were further reflected in children’s changed attitudes towards money and spending. They were seen to develop a more careful attitude to spending, having learned at school how to spend wisely.

The follow account is by a villager, Mr. Leo:

Dari dulu, memang ibu bapa yang kasih kemas itu rumah lah..anak-anak …tapi dulu anak-anak mau kita orang tua yang kasi mandi.. sekarang, anak-anak sudah pandai …ibu pergi masak di dapur, sekarang anak-anak sendiri pergi mandi.. mereka sudah tahu bahawa mereka mesti bersih apabila hendak ke sekolah. Cikgu-cikgu sekolah pun tidak mahu murid-murid ini pergi ke sekolah dengan keadaan tidak kemas, tidak bersih... kuku panjang dan sebagainya. Jadi ini memang bermula dari sekolah...  [Previously, parents are the ones who did all the housework - children even wanted the parents to bath them. Now, the children know to take bath on their own while the mother cooks in the kitchen. They know they need to be clean when going to school. Teachers in school do not want the students to be untidy, dirty, with long nails and so on. All this started from the school... ]

Interview with Mr. Yusuf, villager, 22/2/2013

Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

Interview with Madam Sheila, parent, 21/2/2013

Interview with Mr. Leo, 22/2/2013
6.3.5 Life skills for daily living and employment

Additionally, teachers stated that the children acquired life-skills for both daily living and employment outside the village. Upon leaving the school, the head teacher mentioned that some students were able to find employment in commercial centres such as 1 Borneo Hypermall near Kampung Numbak. This was regarded as a significant change as the teens, especially the girls, had formerly spent large amounts of time in the village seemingly with little purpose. Education is thus seen as being able to assist children from the village gain employment.

As well as procuring employment outside the village, the practical skills acquired from the school also enabled some to develop their own livelihood within the village. Teachers illustrated that the acquisition of bag knitting skills enabled children to earn a living and support themselves. The head teacher also pointed out there is demand locally knitted bags and students proficient in such skills may have a more promising future.
6.4 Changes beyond curriculum outcomes

6.4.1 Enhancement of employment prospects and life quality

Although NEC only provided education for the short duration of two years, it has, in some ways, better prepared the children to face the challenges of the workplace as well as to enhance the life quality of themselves and others. Accounts below show awareness of the importance of education in order to gain employment and ultimately financial independence.

Upon completion of the education program, the children were encouraged by their parents to seek employment to support themselves and possibly their family members. This is a significant contrast compared to the days before they were enrolled into the programme:

The children who received education in the centre could help others who did not go to the school, providing them with an opportunity to learn similar skills that had been learned by the students of NEC. This indicates that the program improves interactions between the members of the community and enhances life quality in the village.

One parent highlighted an example in which her daughter had become better able to care for her younger sibling.

Nah, itulah. Dapat sekolah sini barulah kerja. Dapat tulis-tulis, belajar komputer. Kalau tidak dapat sekolah, tiada lah. Tidak dapat kerja. Mana dapat kerja, tiada sekolah? [They get jobs after graduating from this school. They are able to write and learn computer. If they did not go to school, then they would not have been able to find a job. How can they get a job if they do not have education?]

Interview with Madam Suraya, parent, 21/2/2013

... tiada pengangguran sudah lah... sampai darjah enam saja kan... lepas sekolah tiada sudah... boleh kerja sudah lah [... after they have finished schooling, they can work]

Interview with Teacher Intan, 20/2/2013

Mereka dapat peluang pekerjaan. Macam dia orang ada peluang lah untuk bekerja... kerana diorang ada kemahiran membaca, mengira, menulis... [They have the chance to find and get a job because they have the skills to read, calculate and write]

Interview with Teacher Ida, 20/2/2013

The children who received education in the centre could help others who did not go to the school, providing them with an opportunity to learn similar skills that had been learned by the students of NEC. This indicates that the program improves interactions between the members of the community and enhances life quality in the village.

... dapat membantu kepada golongan golongan yang tidak belajar... dapat memberi matlamat contoh, seperti bidang bidang yang diceburi macam projek projek mengait ni... kalau pelajar-pelajar sudah pandai mengait... mungkin mereka boleh tunjuk pada kawan-kawan dia orang tu atau bapa dia orang... [Can help people who did not get the chance to study... They can be an example. For example, in knitting projects. When the students master the knitting skills, they can teach their friends and family members.]

Interview with Teacher Bahari, 20/2/2013

One parent highlighted an example in which her daughter had become better able to care for her younger sibling.

Begitu lah juga tu maksud kami. Contohnya bagi anak saya, dulu dia tidak pandai didik adik-adik. Jadi lepas dari sekolah dia pandai dah. [That
The most important advantage for the teachers was the increased socio-economic standing they were able to enjoy. Not only were they able to receive an income, but also they could spend more time with their families, as they were working in close proximity to their homes.

6.5 Outcomes for teachers

Teachers also highlighted the outcome related to themselves. While being able to teach the children in their own village, the teachers in NEC also had the opportunity of receiving knowledge through teacher training, conducted by IPG Kent trainers. The advance in teachers’ professional development lead to an increase in respect from parents and villagers. This positive result was a major boost to the teachers and encouraged them to continue their efforts in educating the children.

6.6 Outcomes for the community

6.6.1 Religious values and practices

As presented in an earlier section in this chapter, the introduction of Islamic religious education in NEC has increased the level of religious values and practices of students. This has indirectly influenced their parents. During her interview, the head teacher said that there were more young people in the mosque, showing a significant contrast to the past before the implementation of NEC when only village elders were present in the mosque during prayer times. This statement shows the change within the children’s lives has influenced that of adults.

---

Interview with Madam Sheila, parent, 21/2/2013

*is what I mean. My child, for example, before this he did not know how to teach his younger siblings. Now he knows how to teach them.*

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

*... faedah yang paling pertama... ialah saya boleh dapat pendidikan lah... sebab walaupun saya cikgu... kita tidak boleh cakap kita lebih baik... sebagai cikgu kita juga... kita memberi pendidikan, pada masa yang sama kita juga menerima pendidikan... [The first advantage is that I can get is education. Even though I’m a teacher, we cannot say that we are better than them. As a teacher, we should educate and at the same time get educated]*

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

*Yang paling utama faedah yang saya dapat... setelah saya mengajar di sini... hubungan silaturahim... Kepada ibu bapa dan orang orang kampung sin, ibu bapa, anak-anak yang begitu bah baik sangat, saya berbangga lah, yang begitu sangat sangat baik pada saya... [The main benefit that I get after I teach here is a good relationship. The parents, the villagers and also the children are very good to me. I am so proud because they are very good to me]*

Interview with Head Teacher, 20/2/2013

---

... paling ketara sekarang... saya lebih tahu... menambahkan ekonomi... saya boleh apa tu... memberi bakti lah... apa yang saya belajar dulu di sekolah saya aplikasikan... saya sampaikan kepada diorang, bagi pengalaman bagi diorang macam mana rasanya belajar... [One of the benefits is I can get a job. It helps us economically and I can give back to the community. I can apply what I have learn in school so that they know how it feels to study]*

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

*... terutama sekali sembahyang di masjid, kalau dulu tiada anak-anak, semua orang tua saja... jadi anak-anak sekarang lebih ramai daripada orang tua ... jadi itu bagi saya itu adalah contoh untuk menggalakan yang lain... [... especially in mosque, previously there were no young children, only the elders. Now we have more young children in the mosque, more than*
6.6.2 Values regarding education

Regarding the value of school and education, children who participated in this programme showed a tremendously positive attitude. One parent commented that his child felt very happy learning in the centre as compared to being home, showing more love and sense of belonging for the school than towards his own home. The parents in Kampung Numbak have been observed to be providing more encouragement to their children to learn. Some even collaborated with the NEC teachers to help carry out teaching and monitored their children’s activities. Some hoped for a more ambitious future for their children, such as the opportunity for the children to gain further education at vocational training institutes.

The changed religious values and practices of the students have indirectly impacted the community as a whole. The villagers have a more positive attitude towards religious practices compared to the past, as stated by the head village, Mr. Idris:

Di kalangan penduduk ada juga dari segi kerohanian, keagamaan tu ada juga, oleh sebab-sebab sekolah ni kerana kita pun berkongsilah dengan mereka, berhubung dengan mereka jadi apabila kita panggil atau pun kita bawa mereka berbincang mereka pun akan betul-betul hadirlah… [Among the villagers, they are responsive towards religion and spiritual aspects, they are more willing to communicate, share and discuss… ]

Interview with Mr. Idris, 22/2/2013

In addition to the parents, the village head also added that they organised more religious activities as a result of more young people being involved in routine prayers and recitation of the Quran:

Ya, kita pernah juga buat khatam Al-Quran, kita guna surau di Numbak dekat bawa dan kita libatkan petugas khas, dia telah buatlah dan merasmi, yang khatam Al-Quran tu, kalau saya tak silap 2012, kita pernah buat khatam Al-Quranlah… [We organized ‘khatam Al-Quran’, we use the surau in Numbak and we involved officers from the Special Task Force to conduct the event in 2012 …]

Interview with Mr. Idris, 22/2/2013

... perubahan yang paling ketara ialah ibu bapa semakin… macam pandai memberi dorongan kepada anak-anak untuk belajar… kadang-kadang diong pun bagi kerjasama kepada guru-guru… menjalankan proses pengajaran pembelajaran di sekolah… diong meninjau anak-anak diong… memantau lah anak-anak supaya kurang aktiviti yang membuang masa… [the most obvious change is that parents are giving more encouragement to their children to study. Sometimes they collaborate with the teachers to carry out teaching and learning processes in school. They monitor their children and encourage them to use time more effectively]

Interview with Teacher Aina, 20/2/2013

... segelintir ibubapa yang mahu anak-anak mereka untuk teruskan pembelajaran setakat
6.6.3 Attitude and behavioural changes
Since the establishment of NEC, attitude changes have been observed, not only among the children, but also the community. As a result of these attitude changes, behavioural and lifestyle changes among the community members were also observed.

6.6.4 Economic independence
The head teacher saw the viability and potential for skills obtained from NEC, such as bag-knitting, to be translated into income generation initiatives.
for families in the community. These skills were transferred from the teachers to the children, and later to the parents, thus simultaneously acting as a catalyst for income generation and as a means to help parents.

**6.7 Recognition of the AEP**

Teacher Bahari said that his good friend (a parent) reported that a boy who had received a certificate at the end of this programme managed to get a job as a storekeeper.

Ada komen dari ibubapa, syukur Alhamdulilah kerana kesan pada masa ini sijil yang telah dianugerahkan kepada mereka pada tahun lalu, dia orang ada kerja... contoh, satu kawan, bapa dia ni kawan saya... dia tunjukkan saya sijil itu dan budak itu diambil bekerja... sebagai storekeeper... [ there are comments from parents, syukur Alhamdulilah (praise to God), because of the certificate, they were given jobs... for example, a friend whose father is a friend of mine... he showed me the certificate that led to his employment as a storekeeper... ]

Interview with Teacher Bahari, 20/20/2013

However, the recognition of the certificate of AEP remains a serious issue in that it is not equivalent to any of the public academic certificates in Malaysia. Therefore it is not recognised by the Ministry of Education for enrolment into any of the levels of mainstream education.

**6.8 Summary**

In summary, AEP at NEC has become a worthwhile agent of change. The implementation of AEP at NEC brought about a multitude of benefits to the community, particularly the students. The students have attained higher levels of literacy and numeracy. They have also acquired more knowledge of religion, and are able to translate it into practice. Other outcomes gained by the students include increased civic and citizenship consciousness, self-management and living skills. They were able apply...
the knowledge and skills in their daily personal life and employment activities.

The implementation of the programme has also made positive changes to the community. Seeing the benefits for the younger members, the community were able to see the importance of education for the future of the children of the Numbak community. The involvement of students in religious learning has also increased the values and practices of religion among villagers. This, in some ways, has brought about attitude, behavioural and lifestyle changes among the community members.

Although the AEP certificate is recognised for employment of lower level white collar jobs by some employers, it is not recognised at official level by the Ministry of Education and therefore poses limitations for the children to pursue further education and seek employment in better jobs.

In a wider perspective, the centre has served as an agent of change for the students, teachers, and the community at large. The attitude and behavioural changes of the students have indirectly influenced their family members and people who are interacting with them. This might have triggered the observed change in mindset regarding the value of education among community members.

In analysing all data, the research team did not find evidence of negative effects of the implementation of the AEP at NEC. However, it is speculated that the introduction of this ‘mode’ of education, which is inferior in quality and substance compared to main stream education, could have deprived children whose parents can afford fees (for main stream formal education) of more comprehensive formal primary school education.
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7.1 Introduction

The previous chapters (Chapters 3-6) reported on the findings of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and outcomes. This chapter examines the sustainability and scaling up of the AEP programme. The focus revolves around two principal issues: (i) the activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity, examining specifically their strengths and weaknesses, along with the commitment of the affected stakeholders in continuing the Kampung Numbak project activities after the end of the pilot project in December 2013, and (ii) the worth of a large-scale investment to cover all marginalised (undocumented, migrant) children and application in different contexts within the country.

The following sections evaluate the activities that have been carried out in building up stakeholders’ capacity, examining specifically the strengths and weaknesses, and the commitment of the related stakeholders for further backing of the NEC project.

7.2 Community empowerment strategies

There were various activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities. The activities are outlined in the following four sections.

7.2.1 Teacher training

Two phases of teacher training were conducted throughout the 2 years of the implementation of this project. The training sessions were conducted by Mr. Mohd Nazri, a lecturer at the Teacher Education Institute Kent Campus, Tuaran (Institute Pendidikan Guru Kampus Kent, Tuaran). The first phase was conducted in May 2011 followed by the second phase in January 2012. The main goal of these training courses was to produce quality teachers with mastery of knowledge and skills on par with the National Education Philosophy. With the training provided, teachers were better able to control their classes and have become better teachers. According to Teacher Fatin, she was able to handle the class more effectively and can deliver the lesson more proficiently so that the students can understand more easily.

Dengan adanya latihan ini, saya boleh mengawal kelas... saya pendai menyampaikan isi kandungan pelajaran... pelajar saya pun mudah faham... saya pun boleh menjalakan banyak aktiviti... dapat membuat eksperimen sains... ABM bahasa Melayu lah... (With training, I'm better able to control my class, and teach the subject better... my students was able to understand better... I was able to conduct more activities for my students, including conducting scientific experiments and using learning tools for Bahasa Melayu.)

Focus group discussion with teachers, 20/02/2013

The teacher training also contributed towards the aspects of classroom management, school-based assessment, and pedagogy. Teachers could apply the knowledge and skills learned during the training sessions.

... diaplikasi, bermain sambil belajar... bermain sambil belajar ini kadang 1 minggu satu kali melalui pelajaran PJK... Dalam belajar PJK itu, dapat menjaga kesehatan badan senaman kan... pelajar juga ada... apa ini... matematik... contohnya, melambung bola itu membuat kiraan... (I apply learning through playing... sometimes once a week through Physical Education, students learn about health and exercise...about Mathematics, throwing balls and counting...)
7.2.2 Management training
The Education Planning and Research Division (EPRD) also conducted a three-day short training course for teachers to ensure that the operation of the education centre was run accordingly (Concept paper 2011-2012, page 2). The training covered aspects of teacher professionalism, teaching and learning skills and knowledge, conducting an assembly, and co-curriculum matters.

7.2.3 Mentor-mentee programme
A mentor-mentee programme was conducted indirectly by a teacher in the centre. The intention of such a programme was to ensure students who have already completed their study at the centre, could return to offer their help in one way or another. This effort has already born fruit. One of the graduate students from NEC, Teacher Ena, voluntarily offers her help to act as a relief teacher whenever the headteacher or the teacher is not available.

7.2.4 Handicrafts workshop
A basic handicraft skills workshop programme was also conducted at NEC. The 3-day workshop was conducted from June 30th to July 2nd 2011. The training was conducted by Madam Hamizah, an experienced trainer from the Ministry of Education Malaysia. The workshop targetted children aged twelve and above. They were trained to make handicraft handbags and paper craft. Parents and teachers were impressed with the handbags produced by the children using weaving skills taught on the programme and there is significant potential for the community to market the products in the future.

7.3 Strengths of the programme and areas of concern
Based on the activities undertaken, the following are among some of the positive outcomes identified since the implementation of the AEP programme.
7.3.1 Support from the community
The AEP programme was well-received by the community and the support provided from the community was extremely positive. Findings gathered from interviews show that a large majority of villagers are willing to continue with the running of the centre after the pilot phase of implementation. For example, Mr. Yusuf, who is a villager in Kampung Numbak, offered his service to repair damaged doors and windows at the centre without taking any wages. Other villagers expressed their willingness to donate chairs to the centre. Another villager, Mr. Leo was also willing to build tables for the centre if plywood is supplied by a sponsor.

A parent expressed the need for cooperation from the parents for the continuation of the centre. Madam Dorothy stressed that parents need to work together as a single body to take up the responsibilities of running the centre:

Another parent said that helping each other in running the centre is a must to ensure sustainability after UNICEF’s withdrawal. A parent, Madam Suraya, said that they were willing to pay the teachers’ salaries provided they do not request high salaries.

Some parents voiced their support for contributing salaries for teachers at the centre.
A parent, Mr. Yusuf also expressed the willingness to contribute RM10 each month for teachers’ salaries.

These positive responses augur well for the continuity and sustainability of the centre.

### 7.3.2 Commitment of the teachers
Positives also came in the form of commitment of teachers in the programme. It was observed that the commitment of NEC teachers in implementing the AEP was high. The teachers were seen to take on board a lot more responsibilities than expected of them. For example, all the teachers worked far longer hours than stipulated. They were observed to be in school from 8.00AM to 1.00PM, even though their time-tables only indicated a 3-hour workday. Their positive attitude towards teaching the children indicates a potentialy healthy future for the programme.

#### 7.3.3 Areas of concern

According to the concept paper, teaching and learning sessions at NEC were supposed to be conducted in double sessions. However, the research team found that they were conducted in single sessions. This led to the second concern – that the average class size of 52 students were not conducive for effective teaching and learning for children at that young age. The cause of this ‘merger of sessions’ was related to the meagre salary of RM600 for teachers and RM700 for the headteacher. For comparison, it has been gazetted that the minimum wage for private sector in Sabah and Sarawak is RM800 per month with effect from 1 July 2013.

Although there is a simple form of mentor-mentee programme for capacity development as reported in Section 7.2.3, the approach was informal and not structured like what was intended as stated in the concept paper.

#### 7.4 Stakeholders’ commitment for continuation

Stakeholders’ commitment for continuation is another yardstick to gauge the sustainability of the AEP beyond the pilot phase of the AEP implementation. Evidence gathered from various data sources seems to demonstrate a number of positive signs.

#### 7.4.1 Federal Special Task Force (FSTF)

Data collated thus far shows that FSTF has been playing an instrumental role in the implementation of the AEP. FSTF has been seen to actively manage the financial accounts of the programme, appoint teachers for NEC, ensure the security and safety of the students, teachers and also the local community, assist in the operation of the centre, the delivery of the textbooks and teaching aids and ensure the periodic maintenance of the centre.

FSTF is looking at the larger picture of this project. They are acutely aware that the success or failure...
of the project could affect the safety of the country. Therefore, by providing adequate education to these unreached children, this effort could nurture them to be loyal to Malaysia. Hence, FSTF will need to continue to solicit funds in order to sustain this centre and to bring transformation to these children.

7.4.2 Ministry of Education (MOE)
The Ministry of Education has been playing the role of curriculum provider and teacher trainer in this project. Insofar as the AEP is concerned, MOE planned the curriculum and trained the teachers from NEC through the Kent Teacher Training Institute, Tuaran. MOE through the Sabah State Education Department (SSED) also conducted supervision and monitoring activities as well as contributing textbooks to NEC.

MOE also shows an interest in offering further professional support to ensure this centre will continue to operate. According to Madam Nor Fariza and Mr. Amzan from MOE, the ministry has started discussion among committee members to find alternative ways to continue the AEP. Regarding the continuation of this programme, they have made the following comments:

Email Interview with Madam Nor Fariza and Mr. Amzan, 22/03/2013

MOE suggested the need for having a smart partnership with the existing agencies such as National Security Council (MKN) and the Malaysia Department of Islamic Development (JAKIM) to solicit funds for the continuing programme. Furthermore, it is suggested that the Teacher Training Division (IPG) and Sabah State Education Department (SSED) should also come in as direct stakeholders to support AEP education for NEC in the future. For example, IPG can continue to train NEC teachers to deliver teaching and learning more effectively for the benefit of the children. SSED can assist in coordinating and monitoring the day to day running of the centre in the future.

7.4.2 Malaysia Teachers’ Foundation (MTF)
According to the UNICEF concept paper on AEP in Malaysia, sustainability of the AEP programme in Kampung Numbak can be seen as a possible option when UNICEF finally withdraws officially after three years into the running of the project. The paper also reported that MTF, was initially chosen to be the successor for the continuation of AEP in Malaysia. MTF was chosen because of its capability in dealing with educational issues and also its strong financial capability as a fully-fledged Foundation.

The role of MTF is to solicit funds for future AEP centres in Malaysia. When the NEC project ends, MTF should continue to be an active member funding the AEP programme in Kampung Numbak. In this project MTF also assisted MOE, FSTF and UNICEF in the implementation of the project, especially in the teacher training program and procuring extra funding for NEC through FSTF. Judging from the commendable commitments shown by the interested stakeholders in making the NEC AEP a success, MTF should continue to play the same role for other AEP centres in Malaysia.

7.4.4 Teacher Education Institute, Kent Campus (IPG Kent)
According to Mr. Mohd Nazri, a lecturer of IPG Kent who conducted a number of professional development courses attended by the teachers of NEC, IPG Kent would continue to give support for the AEP programme. He reiterated that IPG Kent would help by organising community engagement activities for the centre. In addition to that, they would...
also engage in a smart partnership with the NEC by providing trainee teachers for practicum sessions at the centre.

Based on the findings gathered from (i) the activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity, their strengths and weaknesses, and the commitment of the affected stakeholders to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal, there are indications to suggest that the AEP has the potential to be scaled up.

7.5 Scaling up the AEP

Scaling-up involves reaching larger numbers of a target community in a broader geographic area by institutionalizing an effective programme (African Youth Alliance, 2004). Scaling up of the Kampung Numbak AEP programme, requires consideration of factors such as current physical and environmental conditions. Scaling up the project can reach other gazetted illegal immigrants centres sharing similar contexts and background to Kampung Numbak, such as Kampung Bahagia, Sandakan etc. The fact that Sabah has 33 gazetted illegal immigrants centres (UNICEF Concept Paper, 2009) and 43,973 undocumented children who are ‘not in schooling’ exist in Malaysia (UNICEF Concept Paper, 2009) warrants urgent attention by the government. Although the government is considering the idea of setting up AEP centres for undocumented children in line with the Geneva Convention on the Rights of the Child Article 28 (1)(a), several important factors need to be given due consideration before scaling up of similar existing AEP centres in Malaysia can,
viz., policy-in-place, accreditation, programme specifications, capacity building and financial resources.

7.5.1 Improving AEP at Kampung Numbak

The AEP objectives for NEC established prior to its inception did not relate to the desired results and outcomes. According to UNICEF, one of the objectives of AEP at Kampung Numbak is to build a basic education centre for the undocumented children at Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu (source: UNICEF Concept Paper, 2009). The term ‘basic’ is not defined and specified in the concept paper and subject to interpretation.

Enrolment in the school increased by 7.02% from 225 students in 2011 to 250 students in 2012. Enrolment in 2013 further increased by 0.21% to 306 students. The basic education centre has 6 classrooms, a resource centre, a staffroom cum office and 2 toilets operating at full capacity. Further increase in enrolment could give rise to complications if the basic infrastructure and facilities are not correspondingly improved. For instance, some of classrooms lack space for tables (Class 1 and Class 6), there are insufficient books in the library and dirty toilets are an issue. Any effort for further scale up will need to seek alternative funding beyond that which is provided by UNICEF for the pilot project.

For NEC to function more effectively, the management of the centre, particularly FSTF and the head teacher need to ensure that the physical, resource and curriculum need to meet the minimum standards set by the Ministry of Education. In order
to scale up AEP centres nationwide, the government must ensure that new AEP centres adhere to all standard national school specifications related to building and occupational health safety, curriculum and other basic child human rights legislation as championed by UNESCO as well as UNICEF. These regulations and guidelines must be incorporated into the national AEP policies.

7.5.2 Capacity building
In the pilot phase of the project (2011-2013) it was observed that through the Teacher Education Division of MOE, the teachers at NEC were given basic training to administer, manage and teach students of NEC. Out of the six teachers who are currently teaching at the centre, only one who possessed the Malaysian Higher School Certificate (STPM) fulfilled the minimum qualification required for teacher training according to national standard. Under this pilot project, the MOE however had given the teachers at NEC exemptions in order for them to receive basic teacher training.

The research team also found that trained teachers helped improve the academic performances of the students. For instance, according to UNICEF, initial illiterate rate was 90% at NEC and having attended the programme, the children’s LINUS performance improved by leaps and bounds (interview with head teacher, 20/2/2013). Besides acquiring bag-knitting skills via the vocational component of the AEP curriculum, interviews with the teachers, parents and the villagers also showed other improvements such as the acquisition of basic literacy skills, such as reading, writing and counting which also contributed to the children’s ability to fill up forms for their parents (interview with Teacher Ida, 20/2/2013). Therefore, teachers’ potential must be developed via continuous training by MOE.

If the AEP programme is to be scaled up further, teacher selection needs to be given due consideration. Besides that, continuous short-term teacher training must be provided to teachers teaching at AEP centres.

7.5.3 Financial resources
Increasing funds or investment in the AEP programme is needed before any scaling up plans can be drawn up. The present pilot AEP project in Kampung Numbak was allocated a one-off funding of RM 495,663.00 for a three-year duration. This included physical development and management of teachers at NEC. Findings indicate that not much improvement could be made to the physical facilities and human resource development throughout the three-year duration.

In order to scale up future AEP centres, the government needs to ensure sustainable funding for the survival of each centre. It is suggested that the government needs to set up a working committee consisting of representatives from the MOE, Finance Ministry and possibly FSTF to oversee and work out the annual amount of allocation for the running of AEP programmes in Malaysia so that scaling up of respective AEP centres can be realised. This would be similar to government schools which are given a fixed allocation based on student enrolment for School Heads to run their respective school efficiently.

7.5.4 Accreditation
Accreditation is an important scalability factor. Currently, the certificate offered upon graduation from NEC is not recognized by the Malaysian government. Presently, under this pilot project, the government role is only to assist FSTF and MOE in providing an AEP for the undocumented children. Despite non-recognition of the NEC certificate by the government, some private companies and restaurants in the vicinity of Kampung Numbak accepted the certificate on application for jobs that required general duties such as store keeping. In addition, according to the head teacher, the living skills acquired from the AEP aided children in getting employment outside of the village, for example at 1Borneo Shopping Centre which is nearby Kampung Numbak (source: interview with head teacher, 20/2/2013)
To ensure the scalability of the current AEP programme it is imperative that a national level committee be established to discuss and settle issues related to accreditation of the AEP curriculum. It is recommended that MOE, via the committee, play an important role in scrutinising and certifying the suggested curriculum for AEP in Malaysia. The committee should also study and deliberate on convincing the government to allow the AEP programme to function as a viable alternative to mainstream education system for refugee and undocumented children in Malaysia.

### 7.5.5 Policy-in-place

Before more AEP centres in Malaysia are created, there must be a fair, equal and non-biased AEP policy-in-place that is somewhat equivalent to AEP programmes in other countries. There are currently no national level policies for AEP programmes in Malaysia. Therefore, it is recommended that the government must facilitate the formulation of a national AEP policy jointly framed by MOE and relevant agencies such as FSTF, MTF along with related interest groups from NGOs. These policies would serve as AEP implementation guidelines for setting up AEP centres in other areas in Malaysia. Improvement to the AEP curriculum has also been suggested, for instance, MOE proposed a K9 curriculum for AEP (refer Figure 7.1) which emphasizes the level of knowledge disseminated based on age.

**FIGURE 7.1 MOE’S K9 AEP MODEL**

Source: Presentation at Roundtable for AEP 2013 by Madam Nor Fariza
This curriculum model can be adopted by the government to be implemented in line with the national AEP policy for Malaysia when planning and setting up future AEP centres.

7.6 Summary

This chapter discussed issues of sustainability and scaling up of the AEP programme. Regarding the issue of sustainability, the Kampung Numbak community showed a willingness to contribute to the future of the project in various aspects including workforce and financial contribution. In addition, there were strong voices of requests from NEC teachers, parents and students of NEC for the continuation of the school. With regard to scalability, the pilot AEP at Kampung Numbak could serve as a successful model for AEP practice in Malaysia. Five important factors need to be taken into consideration in scaling up the programme, namely; policy-in-place, accreditation, programme specifications, capacity building and financial resources.
8.1 Summary of findings

Chapter 1 describes the assessment of a pilot Alternative Education Programme (AEP) at Kampung Numbak, Sabah. The project employed participatory approach based on UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards from a human rights' perspective, based on the parameters of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome and sustainability of the programme. The methods of inquiry included document analysis, product analysis, in-depth interview, focus group interview, observation, survey questionnaire and case study involving all the stakeholders involved in implementing the programme; namely UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, MTF, NEC and the community of Kampung Numbak.

To set the scene for the assessment, Chapter 2 examines the international policies related to AEP which include United Nations Millennium Development Goals, UNESCO's Education for All, and United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. AEPs practised in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Nepal, the Philippines were also reviewed to provide a basis for comparison with Asian and Malaysian contexts. Closer to home in Malaysia, the study also reviewed other related AEPs provided by international bodies and non-governmental organisations for plantation worker’s children in Sabah and Rohingya refugees in Malaysia.

Chapter 3 focuses on the first criteria of the assessment: relevance. It reflected on the situation of the underprivileged community and the needs of the children to obtain schooling opportunity. These marginalised children faced difficulties in joining mainstream education because of their status and the complex procedures of obtaining documentation to gain entry into mainstream education. The need of an AEP in Kampung Numbak was identified and classified into two factors; firstly, the difficulties in gaining access of the mainstream school due to the aforementioned inherited status, secondly, the awareness of the community in Kampung Numbak of the needs for the children to receive some form of formal education. With these reasons established, finally the establishment of the Kampung Numbak EduCare Centre was undertaken.

Chapter 4 outlines the effectiveness of implementation of the AEP in relation to a number of criteria, namely, the programme’s objectives and components, capacity building, enrolment, implementation, and students' learning performance. Firstly NEC was successfully built; teaching resources, textbooks and teaching aids were provided; and the programme was appropriately monitored and supervised. In this respect, all stakeholders, particularly UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, and MTF have played their roles well in getting the NEC off the ground. Although there are shortcomings in terms of the lack of adequacy and relevancy of teaching resources and the absence of a systematic mentor-mentee programme for capacity development, NEC appeared to have satisfactorily achieved all objectives of its establishment. In relation to teacher training and capacity building for the teaching staff in NEC, it was found that were marginally dealt with and efforts to expand these areas thus both areas far seemed rather tepid and lacked enthusiasm. In the case of child enrolment in the centre, the progressive increment in enrolment augurs well for acceptability and increasing importance of NEC. While the scrutiny on issues related to teaching and learning implementation revealed some shortcomings, the special AEP curriculum implemented in NEC has recorded an impressive improvement in all areas of curriculum taught - (1) literacy and numeracy, (2) KAFA, (3) life skills, (4) civics and citizenship, and (5) character development, implying that students have improved their knowledge, skills and practices in these areas. Nevertheless, the basic AEP curriculum model implemented at NEC lacked comprehensiveness and fell short of the MDG’s recommendation of a full course primary schooling of five years. This issue, however, has been acknowledged by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia,
and an improved and a more comprehensive version of the curriculum has since been developed in 2012.

Chapter 5 describes the efficiency in programme and financial management along with roles of stakeholders, NEC, and the community at Kampung Numbak. The partnership of various governmental and non-governmental agencies has been the key to success in achieving efficient NEC programme management. Each of the stakeholders (UNICEF, MOE, FSTF, SSED and MTF) has fulfilled their roles and has been successful in contributing to the efficiency of NEC programme management. The school has successfully played its role by functioning as an agent of change in the behaviour, attitude and values of the students, parents and villagers and as a centre to encourage religious practice among the students and the villagers. The community can be seen to have effectively collaborated with the school in providing informal education and support for students at activities conducted by FSTF, MOE and UNICEF. As a result of the partnership, the school and the community have efficiently played their roles in terms of AEP success at NEC. As for financial management, the overall expenditure has slightly exceeded the allocation.

Chapter 6 reviews the outcome of the project. The implementation of the AEP at NEC brought about a multitude of benefits for the community, and in particular, the students. The students have attained higher levels of literacy and numeracy. They have also acquired more knowledge of religion, and have become able to translate it into practice. Other outcomes gained by the students include improved civic and citizenship consciousness, self-management and living skills. They were able to apply this knowledge and these skills in their personal daily lives and employment activities. The implementation of the programme has also made positive changes to the community. Seeing the benefits on the younger members, the community were able to see the importance of education for the future of their children. The involvement of students in religious learning has also strengthened the values and practices of religion among the villagers. This in turn, has brought about attitudinal, behavioural and lifestyle changes among the community members. Seen from a wider perspective, the centre has successfully served as an agent of change for the students, teachers, and the community at large. The attitudinal and behavioural changes of the students have indirectly influenced their family members and people who interact with them. This might have triggered the observed change in mindset on the value of education among the community members. Evidence of negative effects of the implementation of the AEP at NEC was not found.

Chapter 7 focuses on the issues of sustainability and scaling up of the programme. Regarding the issue of sustainability, Kampung Numbak community showed willingness to contribute in various aspects including manpower and financial contribution. In addition, there were strong voices of request from NEC teachers, parents and students of NEC for the continuation of the school. With regard to scalability, the pilot AEP at Kampung Numbak could serve as a successful model for AEP practice in Malaysia. Five important factors need to be taken into consideration in scaling up the programme, namely, policy-in-place, accreditation, programme specifications, capacity building and financial resources.

8.2 The way forward

A presentation findings of this assessment was held on 23 August 2013 for the main stakeholders and related NGOs who are potential stakeholders, followed by a roundtable discussion among the main stakeholders. Feedback from the presentation and roundtable discussion indicated that there is a need for;

i. continuously advocacy on refugee and undocumented children’s rights to education;

ii. FSTF to assist in the management and administration of the NEC;
iii. quality teaching and learning in NEC;
iv. engagement with new stakeholders for financial assistance;
v. identification of new partnerships with NGOs for expertise, knowledge and experience sharing;
vi. the Kampung Numbak community to take ownership of NEC, and
vii. identification and implementation of income generating activities in NEC and Kampung Numbak.

The need to advocate education for refugee and undocumented children is imperative considering that they are part of the society and that they need to be nurtured as human capital who will contribute to the development of the nation. Advocacy to raise awareness of their plight and subsequently to convince decision-makers to accept their right to education is the primary task to be undertaken.

Findings of the assessment strongly suggest that new stakeholders need to be identified and included to obtain support in terms of finance, knowledge and expertise sharing. Suggested potential new stakeholders include Al-Bukhary Foundation, Zakat Centre, Food for Hungry International, the Malaysian Islamic Economic Development Foundation (YaPEIM), Yayasan Sabah Group, Sabah state government and Partners for Community Organisations in Sabah (PACOS). A trust fund to assist the children in paying school fees and preparing learning materials could be established through patronage by influential figures. Support could also be sought from private corporations as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility.

Following on from the discussion, it was agreed that the AEP cannot and should not be seen as a long-term solution to the plight of marginalized children. A longer and more sustainable framework has to be established. Therefore it is recommended that AEP needs to move beyond its interim goal of providing a stopgap education intervention to one that can be seamlessly integrated into the Malaysian mainstream education system to provide greater equity and accessibility to basic education. Inclusive education will avoid marginalization and polarization among the already diverse population in Sabah. Integrating the refugee and undocumented children into the mainstream education system will essentially enable unity to be formed between them with the larger society. Furthermore, inclusive education would avoid any perception of the affirmative action of the separate AEP being seen as unnecessary favouritism to a particular group. Thus, recommendations are made to phase out the AEP stage by stage. AEP providers such as NEC will be eventually turned into community learning centres focusing on advocating lifelong learning among the communities.

Findings obtained from this study have illuminated to a certain degree the plight of this marginalised group of learners in terms gaining access to basic education in Malaysia. However, what this study has uncovered is only the tip of the iceberg. There is a need for more comprehensive evidence about existing AEPs in Sabah through further research related to education and welfare of refugee and undocumented children in Sabah. Additional data needs to be collected to help throw more light on the issues concerned. Future research such as meta-analysis, situational analysis and profiling of centres providing AEP in Malaysia should be implemented. The outcomes of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on illegal immigrants in Sabah should also be considered for future research on AEP. It is hoped such findings and recommendations will provide UNICEF the ammunition for stronger advocacy to encourage greater buy-ins among relevant stakeholders to minimise or ameliorate the shortcomings highlighted thus far.
8.3 Recommendations for stakeholders

The establishment of AEPs in Malaysia has provided opportunities for better access to education for refugee and undocumented children. The programmes have also translated the fact that children, regardless of identity, need to be nurtured for the benefit of larger society. Relevant government-level amendments and changes are necessary to further augment the development and sustainability of Alternative Education in Malaysia generally, and NEC in Kampung Numbak specifically.

i) UNICEF
- Seek partnerships from NGOs for knowledge, expertise and experience sharing.
- Seek partnerships with government and private agencies to sustain the alternative learning programme.

ii) MOE
- Continue to monitor the teaching and learning process and assessment conducted in NEC.
- Set up a working committee consisting of representatives from the MOE, Ministry of Finance and possibly FSTF to oversee the budget for the running of NEC.
- Facilitate the formulation of a common framework for the management of AEP

iii) FSTF
- Assist in establishing business and tourism opportunities which can contribute to NEC financially and provide employment opportunities to the graduates
- Continue to supervise and monitor the programme and bridge the roles of the main stakeholders.

iv) NEC
- Set up a Board of Governors consisting of representatives from UNICEF, FSTF, MOE, UMS, the local government, the Heads of the Village and Food for Hungry International.
- Encourage and assist the community to take ownership of NEC.

v) Kampung Numbak
- Continue to improve the delivery of the curriculum, assessment and management of the AEP.
- Systematise documentation and record keeping related to the management of the centre, human resources and student affairs and achievement.
- Formalise and systematise the mentoring of the current teachers.

vi) UMS
- Provide consultancy on teacher training support and mentoring of teachers
- Assist in establishing income generating activities.

vii) Teacher Education Institutions in Sabah
- Provide teacher training support and mentoring of existing teachers.
8.4 Conclusion

The assessment of the AEP project at the NEC was based on the five criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and sustainability. Evaluation based on the first criterion of relevance helped highlight the necessity of establishing the NEC as an education centre to provide basic alternative education to the marginalised children of Kampung Numbak who had been denied access to education due to their status as refugee and undocumented children. Without the requisite documentation, these children are denied access to mainstream education and hence, the relevance and need for an alternative form of education for the children was established.

The second criterion examined the effectiveness of the implementation of the pilot AEP project at Kampung Numbak under the auspices of UNICEF and smart partnerships with relevant stakeholders such as the MOE, MTF, FSTF, and SSED. Findings in general indicated that the major objectives of the implementation were achieved, viz. establishing the NEC and implementing the AEP at Kampung Numbak, despite the fact that some shortcomings were noted.

The third criterion looked at the efficiency of the programme implemented and the roles played by various governmental and non-governmental bodies, as well as the local community to ensure the success of the AEP. Findings, to a large extent, demonstrated that the processes were efficient.

The fourth criterion evaluated the outcome of the programme itself, looking at the attainment of the students, teachers, and the community. Not only has the programme transformed the daily lives of the children, the attitude of the larger community was also positive towards the results of this programme.

The last criterion focuses on the issues of sustainability and scaling up of the programme. The community of Kampung Numbak, including the parents, teachers and students expressed hope with regards to the continuation of the school. Hence, this programme has the potential to be scaled up to a workable AEP within Kampung Numbak as well as to act as a model for nation-wide AEPs to reach the unreached.

In general, given the very limited budget and resources, it can be concluded that the NEC was relevant and has been implemented effectively and efficiently. It has produced the desired outcomes and, with some improvements, there are possibilities of sustaining the programme in the future. The exercise has also enabled the research team to propose recommendations for scaling up of the programme to other areas with similar contexts.

Utilising feedback from the Roundtable Discussion with present and potential future stakeholders, the research team proposed the way forward for NEC specifically and AEP in Malaysia in general. The recommendations to all the related stakeholders were presented. While the AEP at NEC is found to be relevant, efficient, effective, sustainable and able to be up-scaled; it is envisioned that the ultimate solution for the education of underprivileged children is to join mainstream education. Whether this scenario can be realised or will remain a dream depends on the commitment of the stakeholders.
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ANNEX A

Product Analysis: A Sample Of Student’s Drawing
### PARENTS

#### Relevance

**Q1:** What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?

1. Sejak bila tinggal di Kg Numbak?
2. Suka tinggal di sini?
3. Sebelum Numbak Educare ditubuhkan, apakah aktiviti yang selalu dilakukan oleh kanak-kanak di sini?
4. Sekarang dengan penubuhan Numbak Educare, apakah aktiviti yang biasa dilakukan?
5. Pernahkah anak-anak anda bercerita tentang apa yang mereka suka mengenai sekolah? Kalau pernah, apa yang mereka sering ceritakan?
6. Sejak bila tinggal di Kg Numbak?
7. Suka tinggal di sini?

#### Outcome

(teacher (+admin), parents, village head and villagers)

**Q2:** Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?

1. Adakah projek ini menyebabkan perubahan di kalangan penduduk Kg Numbak?
   
   Misalnya:
   - kepentingan pendidikan
   - kerohanian
   - alam sekitar
   - kebersihan
   - sahsiah diri
   - kualiti hidup

2. Apakah faedah yang diperolehi daripada perubahan tersebut?

**Q3:** What advantages did project participants get, compared to the population not included in the project (both learners and teachers) in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc. Is there evidence of such advantages?

(Children, Teacher and Parents) Interview to ascertain achievement in affective domain.

1. Apakah perasaan anda/anak anda apabila dapat mengikuti projek pendidikan seperti ini?
3. Bagaimanakah sikap yang diperolehi dapat membantu anda?
4. Adakah anda menjadi lebih berdikari setelah mengikuti projek Numbak Educare?

**Q4:** Are there any negative effects caused by the project?

(Children, Teacher, Parents, Village Head and Villagers)


#### Sustainability

**Q5:** Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?

FGD Villagers and Parents

1. Adakah terdapat sebarang rancangan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF pada masa depan?
2. Bagaimanakah rancangan tersebut dilaksanakan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF pada masa depan?

**Q6:** Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?

FGD Villagers, Parents, Children and JKKK Kg. Numbak

1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk menuruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktiviti kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan dalam projek akan datang?

**Q7:** Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?

FGD Parents and JKKK Kg Numbak

1. Apakah sokongan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
2. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan yang berterusan?
TEACHERS

Relevance

Q1: What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?
   1. Sejak bila tinggal di Kg Numbak?
   2. Sejak bila bekerja di Numbak Educare ini?
   3. Sebelum mengajar di Numbak Educare, Cik/Puan bekerja di mana?
   4. Sebelum Numbak Educare ditubuhkan, apakah pandangan Cik/Puan mengenai keadaan kanak-kanak di Kg Numbak?
   5. Apakah harapan masyarakat terhadap pendidikan kanak-kanak Kg Numbak?
   6. Sejak bila tinggal di Kg Numbak?
   7. Sejak bila bekerja di Numbak Educare ini?

Q2: How did the need for intervention fit into the plans of local authorities (JKKK) and existing schools?
   1. Pada pendapat cikgu, sejauh mana Numbak Educare dapat memenuhi harapan masyarakat Kg Numbak?
   2. Apakah kesan daripada penubuhan Numbak Educare terhadap kanak-kanak Kg Numbak?

Effectiveness

Q3: What were the project’s objectives and were they met? Were they met on time as planned? How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?
   1. Apakah pandangan Cikgu tentang objektif penubuhan Numbak Educare?
   2. Pada pandangan Cikgu, adakah objektif penubuhan Numbak Educare tercapai?
   3. Sejauh manakah aktiviti yang dijalankan menyumbang kepada pencapaian objektif projek?
   4. Apakah harapan cikgu terhadap Numbak Educare pada masa depan?

Q4: What were the components of the project, e.g. a. build education centre, b. ensure teachers’ qualification, c. procure teaching materials. What were the specificities of these components?
   1. Apakah pendapat Cikgu terhadap keberkesanan Numbak Educare dalam memberi pendidikan?
   2. Adakah Cikgu berpuas hati dengan kemudahan sekolah yang disediakan?
   3. Apakah kelebihan yang ada di Numbak Educare?
   4. Apakah kelemahan yang perlu diperbaiki?
   5. Adakah kelayakan yang ada pada Cikgu sudah mencukupi untuk mengajar di Numbak Educare? Mengapa?

Q5: How many teachers were trained? Was their capacity building appropriate and sufficient to prepare them for the tasks they were given? What were the main areas, in which they were trained?
   1. Adakah cikgu menerima latihan yang mencukupi untuk menjalankan tugas anda? Jika ya/tidak. Mengapa cik/puan berpendapat sedemikian?
   2. Bagaimanakah latihan yang diterima dapat membantu dalam pengajaran Cikgu?
   3. Apakah aspek-aspek Pengajaran & Pembelajaran yang diberi perhatian dalam latihan guru tersebut?
   4. Dapatkah cikgu mengajar dengan lebih berkesan selepas menghadiri latihan?

Q6: What were the subjects taught? What other activities were performed with the learners?
   1. Apakah mata pelajaran yang diajar di Numbak Educare bagi setiap kelas/tahun?
   2. Selain daripada matapelajaran yang diajar, apakah aktiviti lain yang dijalankan?

Outcome

Q7: Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?
   1. Adakah projek ini menyebabkan perubahan di kalangan penduduk Kg Numbak? (Sila beri contoh)
      Misalnya:
      - kepentingan pendidikan
      - kerohanian
      - alam sekitar
      - kebersihan
      - sahisial diri
      - kualiti hidup
   2. Apakah faedah yang diperolehi daripada perubahan tersebut?

Q8: What advantages did project participants get, compared to the population not included in the project (both learners and teachers) in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc. Is there evidence of such advantages?
   (Teacher and Children)
   1. Adakah Numbak Educare ini membawa apa-apa kebaikan (kanak-kanak/guru)?Jelaskan
   2. Apakah kebaikan yang diperolehi memberi kesan kepada anda (kanak-kanak/guru)? Jelaskan
   3. Adakah kebaikan yang diperolehi memberi kesan kepada anda (kanak-kanak/guru)? Jelaskan
   4. Apakah faedah utama yang diperolehi daripada Numbak Educare?
### TEACHERS

**Children, Teacher and Parents** - Interview to ascertain achievement in affective domain

1. Apakah perasaan anda/anak anda apabila dapat mengikuti projek pendidikan seperti ini?
3. Bagaimanakah sikap yang diperolehi dapat membantu anda?
4. Adakah anda menjadi lebih berdikari setelah mengikuti projek Numbak Educare?

#### Q9: Are there any negative effects caused by the project? (Student, Teacher, Parents and Villagers)

#### Q10: Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement? (FSTF, MOE, Headteacher/teachers)
1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktiviti kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan/diperbaiki dalam projek akan datang?

### VILLAGE HEAD

#### Relevance

**Q1:** What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?
1. Sejak bila En. Habil tinggal di Kg Numbak?
2. Sejak bila menjadi wakil penduduk di Kg Numbak?
3. Sebelum Numbak Educare Numbak Educare ditubuhukan, apakah pandangan En Habil tentang keadaan kanak-kanak di Kg Numbak?
4. Apakah harapan masyarakat terhadap pendidikan kanak-kanak Kg Numbak?
5. Apakah harapan En. Habil terhadap pendidikan kanak-kanak Kg Numbak?
6. Sejak bila En. Habil tinggal di Kg Numbak?

**Q2:** How did the need for intervention (Numbak Educare) fit into the plans of local authorities (JKKK) and existing schools?
1. Pada pendapat En. Habil, bagaimana Numbak Educare dapat memenuhi harapan masyarakat di Kg Numbak?
2. Apakah kesan daripada penubuhan Numbak Educare terhadap kanak-kanak Kg Numbak?

#### Effectiveness

**Q3:** What were the project’s objectives and were they met? Were they met on time as planned? How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?
1. Apakah pandangan En.Habil tentang objektif penubuhan Numbak Educare?
2. Pada pandangan En. Habil, adakah objektif penubuhan Numbak Educare tercapai?
3. Sejauh manakah aktiviti yang dijalankan menyumbang kepada pencapaian objektif projek? (Sila beri contoh)
4. Apakah harapan En. Habil terhadap Numbak Educare pada masa depan?

#### Efficiency

**Q4:** What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE? What was the role of the school and the community?
1. Apakah peranan En Habil dalam membantu pelaksanaan projek ini?
2. Apakah cabaran yang dihadapi oleh En Habil dalam membantu pelaksanaan projek ini?

**Q5:** Are there any negative effects caused by the project? (Student, Teacher, Parents, Village Head and Villagers)

#### Outcome

**Teacher (+admin), Parents, Village Head and Villagers**

**Q6:** Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?
1. Adakah projek ini menyebabkan perubahan di kalangan penduduk Kg Numbak?
   - Misalnya:
     - kepentingan pendidikan
     - kerohanian
     - alam sekitar
     - kebersihan
     - sahsiah diri
     - kualiti hidup
2. Apakah faedah yang diperolehi daripada perubahan tersebut?
**VILLAGE HEAD**

**Sustainability**

**Q7:** Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?  
(FSTF, MOE and Village Head)

1. Adakah terdapat sebarang rancangan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?
2. Bagaimanakah rancangan tersebut dilaksanakan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?

**DATUK MISRI BARHAM (FSTF)**

**Relevance**

**Q1:** What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?

1. Siapakah yang mencadangkan projek Numbak Educare di Kg Numbak ini?
2. Bagaimanakah idea menubuhkan Numbak Educare ini tercetus?
3. Boleh Datuk ceritakan sedikit sebanyak mengenai penglibatan FSTF dalam projek Numbak Educare di Sabah?
4. Apakah visi Datuk tentang pendidikan alternatif di Kg Numbak?

**YAYASAN GURU MALAYSIA BHD**

**Relevance** *(Tan Sri Alimuddin, chairman)*

**Q1:** What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?

1. Boleh Tan Sri ceritakan tentang penglibatan YGMB dengan projek Numbak Educare di Kg Numbak?
2. Apakah peranan utama YGMB dalam Numbak Educare ini?
3. Apakah bantuan yang diberikan oleh YGMB kepada Numbak Educare di Kg Numbak?

**Sustainability**

**Q2:** Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?

1. Pada pandangan pihak tuan/puan, bagaimanakah masa hadapan Numbak Educare?
2. Apakah sumbangan yang boleh YGMB berikan kepada Numbak Educare selepas program ini tamat?

**FSTF (Datuk Misr Barham, Dato Suhami/Pn Siti Norhaini Osli@En Malai)**

**Relevance**

**Q1:** How did the need for intervention fit into the plans of local authorities (JKKK) and existing schools?

1. Apakah tujuan utama penubuhan Numbak Educareini?
2. Apakah harapan Datuk daripada projek Numbak Educare ini?
3. Adakah projek Numbak Educare ini memenuhi keperluan pendidikan seperti yang ditawarkan di sekolah yang sedia ada (kebangsaan/korea)? Mengapa?
4. Adakah projek Numbak Educare ini memenuhi keperluan kehendak masyarakat Kg Numbak?

**Effectiveness**

**Q2:** What were the project’s objectives and were they met? Were they met on time as planned? How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?

1. What were the project’s objectives?
2. Do you think you have achieved all your objectives?
3. Were they met on time as planned?
4. Are you satisfied with what you have achieved so far?
5. Do you have any future plans to sustain this project beyond 2012?
6. How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?

**Q3:** How many teachers were trained? Was their capacity building appropriate and sufficient to prepare them for the tasks they were given? What were the main areas, in which they were trained?

1. Adakah latihan yang diberikan dapat membantu guru-guru?
2. Bagaimanakah latihan yang diberikan membantu guru-guru?
Q4: *What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE? What was the role of the school and the community?*
   1. Apakah struktur pentadbiran projek?
   2. Apakah peranan Sabah Task Force dalam melaksanakan projek ini?
   3. Apakah peranan/tanggungjawab sekolah dalam projek ini?
   4. Apakah peranan/tanggungjawab komuniti dalam projek ini?
   5. Bagaimanakah projek ini dilaksanakan?

Q5: *What is the approximate cost for teaching one child for one school year? What is the approximate cost of training one teacher?*
   1. Berapakah anggaran perbelanjaan untuk mengajar seorang pelajar setahun?
   2. Berapakah anggaran perbelanjaan untuk melatih seorang guru?
   3. Adakah perbelajaran ini mencukupi? Mengapa?

Sustainability

Q6: *Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?* (FSTF, MOE and Village Head)
   1. Adakah terdapat sebarang rancangan untuk memastikan projek tersebut dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?
   2. Bagaimanakah rancangan tersebut dilaksanakan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?

Q7: *Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?* (FSTF, MOE, Head Teacher /teachers)
   1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktiviti kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
   2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan/diperbaiki dalam projek akan datang?

Q8: *Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?* (FSTF, MOE, UNICEF and IPG KENT Trainers)
   1. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?
   2. Apakah sokongan/sumbangan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
   3. Bagaimana pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?

Relevance

Q1: *How did the need for intervention fit into the plans of local authorities (JKKK) and existing schools?*
   1. Apakah peranan utama MOE/EPRD dalam Numbak Educare?
   2. Apakah EPRD mempunyai rancangan jangka panjang tentang AEP? Jika ya, apakah perancangan itu?
   3. Apakah projek Numbak Educareini memenuhi keperluan pendidikan seperti yang ditawarkan di sekolah yang sedia ada (kebangsaan/korea)? Mengapa?
   4. Apakah projek Numbak Educareini memenuhi keperluan kehendak masyarakat Kg Numbak?

Efficiency

Q2: *What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE? What was the role of the school and the community?*
   1. Apakah mekanisma MOE dalam membantu pelaksanaan projek AEP?
   2. Apakah peranan MoE dalam melaksanakan projek ini?
   3. Bagaimana projek ini ditadibir urus di peringkat MOE?

Sustainability

Q3: *Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?* (FSTF, MOE and Village Head)
   1. Adakah terdapat sebarang rancangan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?
   2. Bagaimanakah rancangan tersebut dilaksanakan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF di masa depan?
## MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (MoE)/EPRD

**Q4:** Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?
*(FSTF, MOE, Headteacher/teachers)*

1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktiviti kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan/diperbaiki dalam projek akan datang?

**Q5:** Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?
*(FSTF, MOE, UNICEF and IPG KENT Trainers)*

1. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?
2. Apakah sokongan/sumbangan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
3. Bagaimana pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?

### DR NUR ANUAR/VICTOR KARUNAN (UNICEF)

#### Relevance

**Q1:** How did the need for intervention fit into the plans of local authorities (JKKK) and existing schools?

1. Why is UNICEF involved in this project?
2. How did this project fit into your mandate in general?
3. How did this project fit into UNICEF’s concerns in Malaysia in particular?

#### Efficiency

**Q2:** What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE?

1. How was the project managed at UNICEF?
2. How were the tasks divided among UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE?
3. What were the roles of the school?
4. What were your expectations of the community contributions towards Numbak Educare?

#### Sustainability

**Q3:** Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?

1. What is your plan for alternative education for Kg Numbak beyond 2013?
2. Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kg Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?

**Q4:** Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?
*(FSTF, MOE, UNICEF and IPG KENT Trainers)*

1. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?
2. Apakah sokongan/sumbangan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
3. Bagaimana pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?

### CHILDREN

#### Effectiveness

Focus group interview

**Q1:** What were the project’s objectives and were they met? Were they met on time as planned? How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?

1. Apa yang anda belajar di Numbak Educare?
2. Adakah Numbak Educare membantu anda dalam pembelajaran (kemahiran membaca, menulis dan mengira, agama, kesehatan etc)? Terangkan.
3. Adakah anda berasa seronok belajar di Numbak Educare?

Focus group interview

**Q2:** What were the subjects taught? What other activities were performed with the learners?

1. Apakah mata pelajaran yang diajar di Numbak Educare bagi setiap kelas/tahun?
2. Selain dari pada matapelajaran yang diajar, apakah aktiviti lain yang dijalankan?
### CHILDREN

**Outcome**

**Q3:** Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?
1. Adakah adik-adik masih berminat untuk meneruskan pelajaran setelah menamatkan persekolahan di Numbak Educare?
2. Apakah jenis pendidikan yang adik inginkan setelah menamatkan persekolahan di Numbak Educare?

**Children who did not attend Numbak Educare and children who left the program half-way**

1. Mengapakah adik-adik tidak bersekolah di Numbak Educare? ATAU Mengapakah adik-adik tidak meneruskan persekolahan di Numbak Educare?
2. Adakah adik-adik yang mahu bersekolah di Numbak Educare jika diberi peluang?
3. Apakah perbezaan yang adik-adik rasakan jika dibandingkan dengan kanak-kanak yang bersekolah di Numbak Educare?

**Q4:** What advantages did project participants get, compared to the population not included in the project (both learners and teachers) in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc. Is there evidence of such advantages? (Teacher and Children)
1. Adakah Numbak Educare ini membawa apa-apa kebaikan (kanak-kanak/guru)? Jelaskan
2. Apakah kebaikan yang diperolehi (pengetahuan/perubahan sikap dll)? (Silai beri contoh)
3. Adakah kebaikan yang diperolehi memberi kesan kepada anda (kanak-kanak/guru)? Jelaskan
4. Apakah faedah utama yang diperolehi daripada Numbak Educare?

**Q5:** What advantages did project participants get, compared to the population not included in the project (both learners and teachers) in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc. Is there evidence of such advantages? (Children, Teacher and Parents)
1. Apakah perasaan anda/anak anda apabila dapat mengikuti projek pendidikan seperti ini?
3. Bagaimana sikap yang diperolehi dapat mempengaruhi anda?
4. Adakah anda menjadi lebih berdikari setelah mengikuti projek Numbak Educare?

**Q6:** Are there any negative effects caused by the project? (Children, Teacher (+admin), Parents, Village Head and Villagers)

### HEAD TEACHER

**Effectiveness**

**Q1:** What were the components of the project, e.g. a. build education centre, b. ensure teachers’ qualification, c. procure teaching materials. What were the specificities of these components?
1. Apakah pendapat Puan terhadap keberkesanan Numbak Educare dalam memberi pendidikan?
2. Adakah Puan berpuas hati dengan kemudahan yang disediakan di Numbak Educare?
3. Apakah kelebihan yang ada pada Numbak Educare?
4. Apakah kelemahan yang perlu diperbaiki?

**Q2:** How many teachers were trained? Was their capacity building appropriate and sufficient to prepare them for the tasks they were given? What were the main areas, in which they were trained?
1. Berapakah bilangan guru yang terlibat?
2. Adakah guru-guru menerima latihan yang mencukupi dalam menjalankan tugas mereka? Mengapakah Puan berpendapat sedemikian?

**Efficiency**

**Q4:** What was the management structure of the project? What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE? What was the role of the school and the community?
1. Apakah struktur pentadbiran projek di sekolah?
2. Apakah peranan guru besar dalam melaksanakan projek ini?
3. Apakah peranan/tanggungjawab sekolah dalam projek ini?
4. Apakah peranan/tanggungjawab komuniti dalam projek ini?
HEAD TEACHER

5. Bagaimana projek ini ditadbir urus oleh guru besar?
6. Apakah cabaran yang dihadapi oleh guru besar dalam pengurusan projek ini?

Q5: Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?
(FSTF, MOE, Headteacher /teachers)
1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktivit kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan/diperbaiki dalam projek akan datang?

VILLAGERS

Outcome
(Teacher (+admin), Parents, Village Head and Villagers)

Q1: Is there any evidence of what changes the project caused in their lives and in the community?
1. Adakah projek ini menyebabkan perubahan di kalangan penduduk Kg Numbak? (Sila beri contoh)
   Misalnya:
   - kepentingan pendidikan  - kerohanian
   - alam sekitar  - kebersihan
   - sahsiah diri  - kualiti hidup
2. Apakah faedah yang diperolehi daripada perubahan tersebut?

Q2: Are there any negative effects caused by the project?
(Children, Teacher (+admin), Parents, Village Head and Villagers)

Sustainability

Q3: Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal? FGD Villagers and Parents
1. Adakah terdapat sebarang rancangan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF pada masa depan?
2. Bagaimanakah rancangan tersebut dilaksanakan untuk memastikan projek seperti ini dapat diteruskan tanpa bantuan UNICEF pada masa depan?

Q4: Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?
FGD Villagers, Parents, Childrens and JKKK Kg. Numbak
1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktivit kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan dalam projek akan datang?

JKKK KG. NUMBAK KG. (Numbak Village Committee)

Sustainability

Q1: Which are the strong and which are the weak areas to ensure such continuation/improvement?
FGD Villagers, Parents, Childrens and JKKK Kg. Numbak
1. Apakah aspek yang mempunyai kelebihan/berpotensi untuk meneruskan projek tersebut? Sebagai contoh, aktivit kraftangan dan guru yang berpotensi.
2. Apakah aspek yang perlu digugurkan dalam projek akan datang?

Q2: Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?
FGD Parents and JKKK Kg. Numbak
1. Apakah sokongan/sumbangan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
2. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?

IPG KENT (Teacher Training Institute)

Sustainability

Q1: Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?
(FSTF, MOE, UNICEF and IPG KENT Trainers)
1. Adakah pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?
2. Apakah sokongan/sumbangan berterusan yang dapat diberikan oleh pihak anda?
3. Bagaimana pihak tuan/puan bercadang untuk memberi sebarang sokongan/sumbangan yang berterusan?
## ANNEX C

### Evaluation Form to students of AEP Kg Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah

**Borang Soal Selidik Pelajar AEP Kg Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nama Pelajar</th>
<th>Umur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahap</th>
<th>Kelas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jantina</th>
<th>Perempuan</th>
<th>Lelaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Arahan kepada pelajar:** Sila bulatkan jawapan adik untuk kenyataan berikut di Pusat Educare berdasarkan skala berikut :

- 😊 = **Setuju** dengan pernyataan
- 😕 = **Tidak Pasti** sama ada setuju atau tidak setuju dengan pernyataan
- 😞 = **Tidak Setuju** dengan pernyataan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Tahap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Saya diberi peluang bersekolah di Pusat Educare.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Saya tidak dihalang untuk bersekolah di Pusat Educare.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Saya tidak berpeluang bersekolah di sekolah kerajaan.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Saya tidak perlu membayar sebarang yuran untuk bersekolah di Pusat Educare.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arahan kepada pelajar:** Sila bulatkan jawapan adik untuk kenyataan berikut di Pusat Educare berdasarkan skala berikut :

- 😊 = **Setuju** dengan pernyataan
- 😕 = **Tidak Pasti** sama ada setuju atau tidak setuju dengan pernyataan
- 😞 = **Tidak Setuju** dengan pernyataan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sebelum bersekolah di Pusat Educare</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Selepas bersekolah di Pusat Educare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 7. Saya boleh bertutur.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 8. Saya boleh menulis.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 9. Saya boleh mengira.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 10. Saya mengetahui makanan berkhasiat.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 11. Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan diri.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 12. Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan di sekolah.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊 😊 😊 13. Saya pandai menjaga kebersihan di rumah.</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebelum bersekolah di Pusat Educare</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Selepas bersekolah di Pusat Educare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>15. Saya pandai menganyam bag.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>16. Saya pandai kemahiran kraf kertas.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>17. Saya boleh membaca al-Quran.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>18. Saya boleh membaca doa.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>19. Saya boleh bersolat.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>20. Saya dapat menjalankan ibadah berpuasa.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>21. Saya boleh menggunakan kemahiran membaca dalam kegiatan harian.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>22. Saya boleh menggunakan kemahiran mengira dalam kegiatan harian.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>23. Saya mencintai negara Malaysia.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>24. Saya menghargai usaha yang diberikan oleh negara Malaysia.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>25. Saya menganggap diri saya sebagai rakyat Malaysia.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>26. Saya suka kepada keadaan aman dan sejahtera di kampung ini.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>27. Saya menyumbang kepada keadaan aman dan sejahtera di kampung ini.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>28. Saya menggunakan kemahiran menganyam untuk mencari pendapatan.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>29. Saya menggunakan kemahiran kraf kertas untuk mencari pendapatan.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>30. Saya menggunakan kemahiran bahasa untuk mencari pendapatan.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>31. Saya suka dengan aktiviti melukis.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>32. Saya suka mengikuti acara sukan.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
<td>33. Saya suka aktiviti kebudayaan seperti tarian dan nyanyian.</td>
<td>❌ ❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX D

### Teaching And Learning Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time :</th>
<th>Date :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject :</td>
<td>Teacher’s name :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme/Topic :</td>
<td>Class :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer :</td>
<td>No of children :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENTS’ ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>21 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 30</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interact with another student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact with teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to teacher’s management instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions to teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond accordingly to teacher’s instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond correctly to teacher’s questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write on the board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in the exercise book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in the work book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misbehave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other activities performed by the students:

1. Oral presentation
2. Pair work
3. Group discussion
4. Art work (e.g.: drawing, colouring)
5. Story telling
6. Artistic performance (e.g.: singing, dancing)
7. Role play
8. Simulation
9. Drama performance
10. Practice of religious values
11. Others
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER’S ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>0 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>21 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 30</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers student’s questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes on the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to student’s response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads from textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists students’ individual work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides pair work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infuses values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides spiritual guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs formative assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs summative assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ANNEX E

## Case Study Interview Questions

| Interview – demographic questions. | 1. Terangkan latar belakang keluarga adik?  
(a) Ibu bapa – pendidikan, sosio-ekonomi i.e. pekerjaan, pendapatan  
(b) Adik beradik – umur, pendidikan, sosio-ekonomi (jika ada)  
2. Apakah bahasa utama yang digunakan di rumah adik?  
3. Apakah bahasa lain yang adik boleh bertutur selain daripada bahasa ibunda? Di manakah adik belajar bahasa itu?  
4. Adakah adik bekerja atau bersekolah sekarang? |
| Interview – antecedent questions. | 1. Pernahkan adik belajar sebelum mula bersekolah di Pusat Educare? Jika, ya, di mana dan apakah yang adik belajar?  
2. Pernahkan ibubapa adik mengajar menulis, membaca dan mengira sebelum mula bersekolah?  
3. Pernahkan adik belajar membaca al-Quran, doa, bersolat dan menjalankan ibadah berpuasa? Jika ya, daripada siapa dan di mana?  
4. Apakah harapan adik sebelum mula bersekolah di Pusat Educare?  
5. Terangkan keadaan adik sebelum bersekolah di Pusat Educare?  
   a. kelakuan  
   b. pengetahuan  
   c. kemahiran |
| Interview – process questions. | 1. Boleh adik ceritakan apakah telah anda pelajari di sekolah?  
2. Adakah adik rasa aktifiti sukan penting? Adakah adik berpeluang untuk melakukan senaman atau aktifiti sukan di sekolah?  
3. Adakah adik rasa aktifiti kesenian (lukisan) dan kebudayaan (tarian dan nyanyian) penting? Mengapa?  
| Interview – outcome and impact questions. | 1. Apakah sumbangan Pusat Educare kepada adik?  
2. Adakah pengetahuan yang kamu pelajari berguna selepas tamat persekolahan?  
3. Adakah kemahiran (life skills) yang kamu pelajari berguna selepas tamat persekolahan?  
4. Boleh ceritakan bagaimana anda menggunakan pengetahuan dan kemahiran (menganyam, kraf kertas) yang telah kamu pelajari dari sekolah?  
   a. Di rumah  
   b. Di sekolah  
   c. Dengan kawan  
   d. Dengan orang tua  
   e. Di kampung  
   f. Untuk mencari kerja  
   g. Di tempat kerja  
5. Apakah yang anda bangga dengan pengalaman belajar di Pusat Educare?  
6. Apakah yang akan terjadi pada adik jika tidak bersekolah di Pusat Educare?  
7. Apakah kesan paling besar pada adik setelah bersekolah di Pusat Educare?  
8. Apa rancangan anda untuk masa hadapan selepas anda menamatkan pelajaran di Pusat Educare?  
9. Apakah yang adik boleh sumbangkan kepada Pusat Educare setelah tamat bersekolah?  
10. Apakah yang adik boleh sumbangkan kepada kampung setelah tamat bersekolah?  
11. Apakah cadangan adik untuk menambah baik Pusat Educare? |

---

**Interview – demographic questions.**

1. **Terangkan latar belakang keluarga adik?**
   - Ibu bapa – pendidikan, sosio-ekonomi i.e. pekerjaan, pendapatan
   - Adik beradik – umur, pendidikan, sosio-ekonomi (jika ada)
2. Apakah bahasa utama yang digunakan di rumah adik?
3. Apakah bahasa lain yang adik boleh bertutur selain daripada bahasa ibunda? Di manakah adik belajar bahasa itu?
4. Adakah adik bekerja atau bersekolah sekarang?

---

**Interview – antecedent questions.**

1. Pernahkan adik belajar sebelum mula bersekolah di Pusat Educare? Jika, ya, di mana dan apakah yang adik belajar?
2. Pernahkan ibubapa adik mengajar menulis, membaca dan mengira sebelum mula bersekolah?
3. Pernahkan adik belajar membaca al-Quran, doa, bersolat dan menjalankan ibadah berpuasa? Jika ya, daripada siapa dan di mana?
4. Apakah harapan adik sebelum mula bersekolah di Pusat Educare?
5. Terangkan keadaan adik sebelum bersekolah di Pusat Educare?
   - kelakuan
   - pengetahuan
   - kemahiran

---

**Interview – process questions.**

1. Boleh adik ceritakan apakah telah anda pelajari di sekolah?
2. Adakah adik rasa aktifiti sukan penting? Adakah adik berpeluang untuk melakukan senaman atau aktifiti sukan di sekolah?
3. Adakah adik rasa aktifiti kesenian (lukisan) dan kebudayaan (tarian dan nyanyian) penting? Mengapa?

---

**Interview – outcome and impact questions.**

1. Apakah sumbangan Pusat Educare kepada adik?
2. Adakah pengetahuan yang kamu pelajari berguna selepas tamat persekolahan?
3. Adakah kemahiran (life skills) yang kamu pelajari berguna selepas tamat persekolahan?
4. Boleh ceritakan bagaimana anda menggunakan pengetahuan dan kemahiran (menganyam, kraf kertas) yang telah kamu pelajari dari sekolah?
   - Di rumah
   - Di sekolah
   - Dengan kawan
   - Dengan orang tua
   - Di kampung
   - Untuk mencari kerja
   - Di tempat kerja
5. Apakah yang anda bangga dengan pengalaman belajar di Pusat Educare?
6. Apakah yang akan terjadi pada adik jika tidak bersekolah di Pusat Educare?
7. Apakah kesan paling besar pada adik setelah bersekolah di Pusat Educare?
8. Apa rancangan anda untuk masa hadapan selepas anda menamatkan pelajaran di Pusat Educare?
9. Apakah yang adik boleh sumbangkan kepada Pusat Educare setelah tamat bersekolah?
10. Apakah yang adik boleh sumbangkan kepada kampung setelah tamat bersekolah?
11. Apakah cadangan adik untuk menambah baik Pusat Educare?
# ANNEX F

**NEC Graduate Certificate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bil.</th>
<th>Perkara</th>
<th>Nilaian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LINUS</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahasa Malaysia</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Matematik</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sains</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pendidikan Islam</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pendidikan Sivik dan Kewarganegaraan</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KEMahiran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kraftangan</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KOKURIKULUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Futsal</td>
<td>Baik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sijil Perakuan

Diperakukan bahawa Najib Mohd. Ismail mengikuti Pendidikan Alternatif dan Januari 2011 hingga Disember 2011

Di bawah ini diperhukum ketetapan dan kegiatan pembelajarmnya

Moammar b. Nordin
Guru Besar
Educare Centre Kg. Numbak
Kota Kinabalu

Tarikh: 5 Mei 2012
ANNEX G

Reaching The Unreached: The Assessment Of The Alternative Education For Children In Kampung Numbak

Surat Persetujuan

Kajian Reaching the Unreached: the assessment of the alternative education programme for Refugees and Undocumented Children in Kampung Numbak bertujuan menilai perlaksanaan program pendidikan alternatif di Kampung Numbak.


Sekiranya YBhg. Datuk /Tuan/Puan mempunyai sebarang soalan berkenaan projek penyelidikan atau proses temu bual, sila bertanya kepada ahli penyelidik yang menemubual YBhg. Datuk /Tuan/Puan akan menerima satu salinan surat persetujuan ini sebagai rekod.

Sekian, terima kasih.

Nama Penemubual/Ahli Penyelidik:

__________________________  ____________________________
Nama/Tandatangan Penemubual/Ahli Penyelidik 1  Tarikh

__________________________
Nama/Tandatangan Penemubual/Ahli Penyelidik 2

__________________________
Nama/Tandatangan Penemubual/Ahli Penyelidik 3

Kenyataan Persetujuan:

Saya telah memahami segala kenyataan di atas dan bersetuju untuk ditemu bual. Saya memberi kebenaran untuk dirakam suara/video dan sekiranya mempunyai sebarang soalan berkenaan penyelidikan ini, saya akan menghubungi ahli penyelidik atau sekretariat penyelidikan di UMS (019-8618600, Prof Vincent Pang, Ketua Penyelidik Projek).

Nama Yang Ditemuduga:

__________________________  ____________________________
Tandatangan Yang Ditemuduga  Tarikh
ANNEX H

Call for Proposal

UNICEF Malaysia Country Office is calling for proposals to conduct an assessment of the alternative education programme that was developed for refugee and undocumented children in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah.

Proposals by interested researchers or assessment teams should be based on the Terms of Reference enclosed below and should include the following:

✔ Proposed approach, methodology of work and analytical framework;

✔ Methods and sources of quantitative and qualitative data collection such as surveys, FGDs and interviews, incl. number and representation of studied stakeholders/groups;

✔ Suggested budget by budget items. NB: budget items should refer to activities, i.e. desk review of policy documents, quantitative data analysis, focus group discussions, report writing, travel and logistics etc.

✔ Composition of the evaluation team and respective CVs;

✔ Sample of analytical work on related issues performed by (members of) the evaluation team.

Authors of the shortlisted proposals will be invited to present them to UNICEF and MoE. Details of presentation will be communicated later.
1. Context

1.1. Background

Education is one of the most fundamental aspects in a child's development; the level of education obtained determines the wellbeing of the child when s/he grows up, be it financially, socially or intellectually. The significance of education is evident through programmes by international agencies and developed countries such as UNESCO’s ‘Education For All’ (EFA), USA’s ‘No Child Left Behind’, UK’s ‘Every Child Matters: Change For Children’. Likewise in Malaysia, the Ministry of Education (MOE) has set the same high expectation for all children and to ensure that ‘Every Child Succeeds’, regardless of gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic or circumstances. Malaysia has always placed a high value on education, and a fundamental principle of Malaysia’s EFA approach is to ensure that education services reach to each and every child.

The government’s commitment towards education is reflected under the Federal Constitution Article 21. The article recognizes the right of Malaysian citizen children to have equal access to education regardless of their location and socio-economic status. In addition, the Education Act of 1996 provides for every school-age child in the country free education and automatic promotion for a period of eleven years. In response to a question on education for undocumented children raised by Senator Noriah Mahat (Bernama, Tuesday 20 July 2010), the Minister of Education, Tan Sri Muhyiddin Yassin stated that the government will ensure that undocumented children are given education in line with the principles of ensuring education for all children irrespective of religion, race or location. He added that the Ministry will work in collaboration with implementing agencies such as the Sabah Task Force, the Armed Forces, Teacher Foundation and UNICEF to provide education for out-of-school children.

Over the last 50 years, Malaysia has made enormous advances in education with a continuous focus on access, equity and quality to education. While it is clear that Malaysia has achieved commendable progress in providing access to education, there is still the sense that the country must do better in pursuing the challenging goal of ensuring access for the poor and excluded to equal and quality education. Despite the provision for compulsory education under the Education Act, there are still pockets of children who are not enrolled in schools or have dropped out of the education system. A study conducted by MoE under Article 28(1) Convention on the Rights of the Child in 2009 has shown that from the sample of the study, there were 43,973 undocumented children in Malaysia between the ages of 7 and 17 years old who were not in schools. This number included 5,271 Malaysian citizens and 38,702 non Malaysians. An alternative route to education for those who do not have access to the national education system is essential in order to fulfil children’s rights under CRC and to achieve EFA goals by 2015.

Unlike countries like Thailand or Indonesia, Malaysia has yet to recognize Alternative and Equivalency Programme (AEP) as an option to educational programme equivalent to existing formal education. Evidence has shown AEP are assisting countries in the Asia-Pacific region to progress more quickly towards their 2015 EFA goals and that such programmes are providing opportunities for disadvantaged and marginalized groups. In collaboration with MoE, UNICEF Malaysia plans to use knowledge and evidence gained from the project in Kg. Numbak to advocate for an AEP for refugee and undocumented children who are not able to access the national education system.

1.2 Education for Refugees and Undocumented Children in Sabah

Refugee and children who have no documents to prove their nationality have not been able to access
government services, including health and education. While documents are available upon application, the criteria and process for application is restrictive. Many parents in the migrant worker and indigenous communities do not know the application procedures to obtain the necessary documents or simply cannot afford the travel costs to get a child registered. In addition, Malaysia does not practice or guarantee citizenship by birth alone. A child must have a parent with a Malaysian Identity Card to confirm citizenship.

Whether the issue is legal status, poverty, or distance, the number of refugee and undocumented children in Sabah is rising. These children, mainly from Indonesia and Philippine, face a childhood without a single day in school. Others spend their childhood on the streets, as child labourers, and are exposed at an early age to social ills like glue sniffing, drugs, petty crime, or child abuse.

Education for refugee and undocumented children are available in patches provided by the community, foundations, NGOs, and religious groups. The Sabah Special Task Force (SSTF) manages 33 gazetted centers in Sabah for refugees and illegal immigrants. Most of these centers do not have proper educational facilities. Even if they do, the education centers are often overcrowded (60-100 students per classroom), in very poor condition, receive minimal funding and lack basic facilities such as water, electricity and sanitation.

**1.3 The Education Center, Kg. Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah**

The Education Center in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah was a first initiative by UNICEF in collaboration with MoE, the Sabah Special Task Force, the Teacher Foundation and the community, to provide access to basic education for out-of-school children. The education center follows the National Curriculum with emphasis on reading, writing, arithmetic, Islamic Studies and development of life skills i.e. sewing, knitting, etc. The center which began its operations on 3 January 2011 has to date provided basic education for 300+ refugee and undocumented children.

The Education Center in Kampung Numbak was developed to be a benchmark for the provision of education for refugee and undocumented children in Sabah. In addition to providing education for children, there are plans to make use of the premise to provide adult classes, especially for women. The move is in line with the EFA Goal towards achieving a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015 and ensure equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.

The MoE is in the process of formulating guidelines for an alternative education policy. Once gazetted, the policy guidelines will govern all schools and learning centers providing education opportunities for out-of-school children including dropouts, refugee, undocumented and those children living in plantations. The policy will be further developed to ensure that all children who do not have access to government schools will have an equal opportunity to develop and grow to their fullest potential.

This evaluation will focus on certain aspects of the Kampung Numbak Education Centre project, such as: coverage of children; material, human and financial resources needed for operating of the school; involvement and support from various stakeholders; outcomes for children attending the Centre. It will thus provide necessary evidence to inform the development of the alternative education policy.

**2. Purpose**

The assessment of the Alternative Education Programme for Refugee and Undocumented Children in Kampung Numbak is part of UNICEF Malaysia work plan for 2012. Its purpose is to provide knowledge about the experience, lessons learnt and outcomes from the conception of the project up to the present time that UNICEF, Ministry of Education,
Sabah Special Task Force and other education stakeholders can use as evidence for advocacy work and in the design of the Alternative Education Policy. Findings and recommendations from the evaluation report will be used to further improve the provision of education for other groups of marginalised children.

3. Objectives

The objectives of the assessment, which will contribute to achieving the purpose stated above, are to assess:

- government policy on alternative education and its implications;
- how relevant the programme has been vis-à-vis the situation of children in the communities of intervention and UNICEF’s commitments in this regard i.e. to what extent has it addressed their education needs;
- how effective and efficient it has been;
- what outcomes have been generated for the children, the teachers and the community in the project site;
- whether the Education Centre has ensured its own sustainability beyond the phase of UNICEF’s support;
- whether this model is replicable on a large scale in order to respond to the needs of all undocumented children; and
- recommendations for improvements and way forward.

4. Scope

The scope of the study will cover the implementation of Kampung Numbak Education Centre project since its inception in January 2011 until October 2012.

A series of evaluation questions should be answered in order to meet the evaluation’s objectives; they are clustered by the main evaluation criteria.

**Relevance of the project (why was the project needed)**

- What was the situation of children in Kampung Numbak prior to the initiation of the project, with regard to their education?
- Did it require action to address the situation of these children? If Yes, by who and how?
- To what extent does the intervention fit into the plans of local authorities and existing schools?
- How did the need for intervention fit into UNICEF’s mandate in general and with UNICEF’s concerns in Malaysia in particular?
- To what extent is the project still relevant at this point in time?

**Effectiveness (what are the results of the project)**

- What were the project’s objectives and were they met?
  - Were they met on time as planned?
  - How did the implemented activities contribute to the project objectives?
- What were the components of the project, e.g. a. build education centre, b. ensure teachers’ qualification, c. procure teaching materials. What were the specificities of these components?
- To what extent was the capacity building appropriate and sufficient to prepare teachers for the tasks they were given?
  - What were the main areas, in which they were trained?
- What are the main results of the project?
  - How many children in total benefited from it to date?
  - What were the subjects taught? What other activities were performed with the learners?
o What are the school achievements of these children? Did test/achievement scores change, when compared to project initiation, at the end of year one, at the end of year two?

o Is there any evidence of positive changes in the lives of the children and in the community i.e. in terms of knowledge, behaviour changes, etc?

o Are there any negative effects caused by the project?

**Efficiency (how did the project operate)**

- Were the management structures appropriate for the achievement of results?

  o What were the roles of UNICEF, Sabah Task Force and MoE?

  o What was the role of the school and the community?

- Were the expenditures for the project cost-efficient?

  o What was the budget of the project?

  o What proportions were spent for salaries, school materials, extra-curricula activities, investment/building maintenance?

- To what extent does the investment justify the results-achieved?

  o What is the approximate cost for teaching one child for one school year?

  o What is the approximate cost of training one teacher?

**Sustainability (is the project likely to have future)**

- Were there any activities undertaken to build stakeholders’ capacity to continue the Kampung Numbak project activities after UNICEF’s withdrawal?

- Is there any commitment for further support – from Sabah Task Force, from MoE, from other parties?

- To what extent is the model worth a large scale investment to cover all marginalised (undocumented, migrant) children?

  o What amendments that might be necessary in order for the project to be applied in different contexts within the country

The questions listed above should be addressed from a human rights and gender perspective with consideration of the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards, and should focus on the results.

### 5. Methods for data collection and analysis

The study will apply a participatory approach and will build upon a mixture of information sources – quantitative and qualitative, primary and secondary. These include:

- Review of existing policy and programme documents – to understand the policy environment governing education for refugee and undocumented children;

- Review of Kampung Numbak project documents

- Review of the Education Centre’s records on 1. school enrolment; 2. school achievement of learners, and 3. budget revenue and expenditure;

- Primary data collection from stakeholders: MoE and SSTF officers, parents, teachers, children – to obtain in-depth understanding of the provision of education from the perspective of different stakeholders, through:

  o focus group discussions with parents/and children;

  o interviews with Government officials, community leaders, NGO representatives, development partners;
6. Ethical considerations

The researcher/evaluation team should be acquainted with the principles for ethical research and reporting on children less than 18 years of age and young people and strictly follow them. The team will be responsible to obtain ethical clearance from UNICEF and the appropriate Government agency as necessary.

7. Expected outputs

The following outputs are expected to be produced as a result of the assignment:

- An Assessment Report on the Alternative Education Programme for Refugee and Undocumented less Children in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah addressing the objectives listed above, including an Executive Summary and Recommendations. The structure of the report must be compliant with UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards (these will be provided to the researcher)\(^1\);
- Power point presentation with the main findings and recommendations, which can be presented at launches, dissemination workshops and other events with counterparts.

8. Contract management

UNICEF will request for proposals for an evaluation of the Alternative Education Programme in Kampung Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah based on the Terms of Reference. UNICEF and MoE will collectively review proposals and will agree on the preferred evaluation team.

UNICEF will issue and manage a contract with the researcher/evaluation team. All developed instruments for data collection should be discussed and agreed with UNICEF.

9. Time frame

The envisaged time for development of the evaluation is presented in the table below.

10. Qualifications and skills required

The researcher/evaluation team should possess as a minimum the following qualifications and skills:

- Extensive experience in social science research and human rights, especially in analysis of different policies particularly around issues pertaining to education;
- Familiarity with the context in Sabah, including major obstacles for marginalised groups such as undocumented children and migrants to access basic services;
- Excellent assessment, analytical, conceptual and facilitation skills;
- Knowledge of evaluation methods and data-collection skills;
- Evaluative work experience;
- Experience with conducting field research;
- Excellent writing skills;
- Ability to work at high standards under time pressure.

1. Layout, editing and printing of the final report are not covered by this assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send out request for evaluation proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation proposals received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying evaluation team, incl. issuance of contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalising TOR, develop detailed work plan, incl. methods of data collection and report structure w/ evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of existing policy &amp; programme documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instruments/questionnaires for primary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary data collection and analysis – FGD, interviews, case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First complete draft report submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft report presentation and feedback from UNICEF and MoE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalising report w/ included feedback and submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report endorsement by UNICEF and MoE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Application For Student Card

STATUS
Non-Citizens
(With or without Identity Card)

FILL IN THE FORM
• Application form for student pass for non-citizens (3 copies)
• Photocopied passport/True Certified IMM document by the embassy according to the issued passport country
• Certified photocopied birth certificate according to issued country

HEAD MASTER OF THE SCHOOL APPLIED
• Depending on the vacant of the school, the headmaster will endorse the application

KOTA KINABALU EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
• Form will be sent to State Education Department
• Submit to Ministry of Education

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
• MOE will have meeting to approve the application
• Approval letter issued for registration in school (Student card)

STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
• Deliver the card to the school

SCHOOL
• Accept the student for enrolment

Source: Telephone interview with SK Pulau Gaya Headmaster on 15th March 2013
# MOE visits to NEC

## 1. Monitoring and Coordination

**a. Monitoring the physical development of Educare Centre Kg. Numbak August - September 2010**

- 4 August 2010
  - Meeting on coordination of MOE-UNICEF Collaboration Programme

**b. Monitoring of operations in Educare Centre Kg. Numbak**

- 21 January 2011
  - Meeting on the Opening Ceremony of Educare Centre Kg. Numbak

- 26 March 2011
  - Opening Ceremony of Educare Centre Kg. Numbak

- May 2011
  - Distribution of KBSR Year 1 Textbook

- 30 June – 2 July 2011
  - Distribution of Materials for Basic Skills Training

- 30 June 2011 – 2 July 2011
  - Distribution of Reading Materials

- 18 – 20 August 2011
  - Meeting on the coordination between MOE-UNICEF and PPKPSL

- 29 September 2011
  - Meeting on the coordination between MOE-UNICEF and PPKPSL

- 23 – 24 October 2011
  - Monitoring on the implementation of LINUS Module and distribution of reading materials

- 5 – 6 December 2011
  - Meeting on the Coordination of Implementation of Alternative Education in Sabah.

- 1 February 2012
  - Meeting on the Coordination of Alternative Education in Educare Centre Kg. Numbak.
  - The visit of Ambassador of The Philippines to Educare Centre Kg. Numbak.

- 21 February 2012
  - Meeting on the Coordination of Alternative Education

- 22 – 23 March 2012
  - Study of the Impact Evaluation on Teacher Competencies of the AEP Pilot Project in Educare Centre Kg. Numbak and Students’ Performance.
  - Distribution of additional training materials.
  - Meeting on the Coordination of the Certificate of completion for students of Educare Centre Kg. Numbak.

- 5 May 2012
  - Meeting on the Coordination of the Certificate of completion for students of Educare Centre Kg. Numbak.

- May 2012
  - Distribution of KBSR Year 2 Textbook
### 1. Monitoring and Coordination

- **25 July 2012**  
  Meeting on the coordination between MOE-UNICEF and PPKPSL

- **20 February 2013**  
  Mid-term Review and Work Plan Meeting with UNICEF

- **15 May 2013**  
  Prospective teacher interview for Educare Centre Kg. Numbak, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah

- **June 2013**  
  Distribution of Year 3 KBSR Textbooks

### 2. Specialist service on conducting 4 sessions of teacher training. 2 training sessions conducted by BPPDP officials, which were:

**a. Basic teacher training (20 – 22 January 2011)**

- Training conducted by BPPDP officials. The training covered the module consisting of:
- MOE employed the specialist service of lecturers from IPG Kent, Sabah. The training module was consisting of:
  - Basic teacher dynamics
  - Teaching record management
  - Teacher and student attendance management
  - Building teaching tools
  - LINUS Stage 1 Module
  - Teaching methodology

**b. Basic Skills Training (30 June – 2 July 2011)**

- Training conducted by BPPDP officials, consisting of following items:
  - Basic Knitting and paper craft
  - Knitting Hand bag
  - Knitting pencil cases
  - Making souvenir paper bags
  - Greeting cards
  - LINUS Programme Evaluation
  - Academic Module Briefing (Malay Language, Mathematics, English Language, Civic and Citizenship)

**c. Intensive Pedagogy Course Phase 1**

- MOE employed specialist service from lecturers from IPG Kent, Sabah. The module constructed was consisting items as follows:
  - Classroom management and student behavior
  - Teacher and Current Challenges
  - Approaches on handling disruptive students
  - Reality TV learning
  - Learning through drawing therapy
  - m-Learning
  - Reality TV learning
  - Learning through drawing therapy
  - m-Learning
  - Responsive Pedagogy
  - Play while learning
  - Learning through Social Constructivism
  - Participative learning
## 2. Specialist service on conducting 4 sessions of teacher training. 2 training sessions conducted by BPPDP officials, which were:

- School-based Assessment
- Item Buiding
- Arts Exercise Activity
- Traditional Games
- Station Games Activity

### d. Intensive Pedagogy Course Phase 2

MOE employed specialist service from lecturers from IPG Kent, Sabah. The module constructed was consisting items as follows:

- Teacher and Current Challenges
- Learn while Playing
- Student and Learning Environment
- School-based Assessment and Item building
- Classroom Management and Student behavior
- Learning through drawing therapy
- Participative learning
- Motivation and Teacher character concept
- Reality TV learning
- Creativity in Teaching and Learning
- Station Games Activity
- Traditional Games
- Learning through Social Constructivism

## 3. Information sharing and spreading regarding AEP in Malaysia especially Pilot Project in Educare Centre Kg. Numbak.

### a. 13 – 15 May 2012

Presentation of Paper on the Alternative Education in the Study on Dropouts.

MOE-UNICEF Collaboration Programme 2012: Reaching The Unreach: Towards Achieving Universal Primary Education For All In Malaysia organised by EPRD

### b. 30 October 2012

Presentation of Paper on Alternative Education in Facilities of Education for Rohingya Children in Malaysia Workshop: Forming an action plan, organised by IKMAS, UKM

### c. 7 – 9 November 2012

Information Sharing on Regional Meeting on Primary Equivalency Alternative Schooling/Equivalency to Reach the Unreach in Bangkok, Thailand organised by UNESCO

### d. 18 December 2012

Presentation of paper on Alternative Education in the Dialog and Roundtable Discussion on the directions of Alternative Education in Malaysia.

### e. 21 – 23 March 2013

Presentation of paper on Alternative Education in Alternative Education Workshop, organised by Education Faculty, Universiti Malaya.

### f. Collaboration with PPKPSL in drafting proposal on up-scaling education to children without documents (Kg. Bahagia, Sandakan, Sabah)
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Photos
Photographs

Photo 1  Main entrance to NEC

Photo 2  Desk arrangement to accommodate large number of students

Photo 3  NEC seen from the side

Photo 4  NEC teachers attending the teacher training session with teachers from other AEP at Bahagian Teknologi Pendidikan, Penampang, Sabah

Photo 5  Staffroom at NEC

Photo 6  The library which is also used as a storeroom

Photo 7  In a class (Class 3) at NEC

Photo 8  NEC Main ‘hall’ for assembly/activities

Photo 9  An overcrowded classroom with students sitting on the floor
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